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<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAA</td>
<td>Accra Agenda for Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIDA</td>
<td>Canadian International Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMESA</td>
<td>The Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREAM</td>
<td>Clear, Relevant, Economic, Adequate, Monitorable (criteria for indicators)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECCAS</td>
<td>The Economic Community of Central African States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOWAS</td>
<td>The Economic Community of West African States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEG</td>
<td>Independent Evaluation Group (World Bank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITC</td>
<td>International Trade Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LF</td>
<td>Logical Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFA</td>
<td>Logical Framework Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFM</td>
<td>Logical Framework Matrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM</td>
<td>Logic Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCPS</td>
<td>Member Country Partnership Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDBs</td>
<td>Multilateral Development Banks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDGs</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MiDR</td>
<td>Management for Development Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOV</td>
<td>Means of Verification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPAD</td>
<td>New Partnership for African Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVI</td>
<td>Objectively Verifiable Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRSP</td>
<td>Poverty Reduction Strategy Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QQT</td>
<td>Quantity, Quality, Time (criteria for indicators)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBM</td>
<td>Results-Based Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMART</td>
<td>Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-Bound (criteria for indicators)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDP</td>
<td>Trade Development Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSI</td>
<td>Trade Support Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>United States Agency for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preface

The Programme for building African Capacity for Trade (PACT II) is a trade-related technical assistance programme, executed by the International Trade Centre (ITC) and funded by the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA). It aims at supporting Africa’s regional integration agenda and efforts to achieve economic development and fight poverty.

The Programme is based on a partnership between ITC and three Regional Economic Communities (RECs), namely the Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA), the Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS) and the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) as main counterpart organizations.

PACT II strengthens the support capacity of African regional and national institutions to enhance export competitiveness, market linkages and export revenues of African small and medium size enterprises with a special focus on women-owned enterprises. It revolves around the following four outcome areas:

1. Fostering pan-African partnerships and networking for regional trade development and export promotion in Africa;

2. Enabling RECs to take the lead as trusted and visible brokers for sustainable and inclusive regional trade development and promotion;

3. Strengthening regional trade support networks, including business women’s networks;

4. Enhancing cross-border business linkages and enterprise-level export success in priority sectors and markets, with a special focus on women exporters.

The implementation strategy of the programme is guided by key principles of capacity development to ensure sustainability, maximize African ownership, build on other key pan-African, regional and national initiatives, while giving due consideration to cross-cutting themes including gender and environment.

Under the outcome two, the ITC has carried out in close cooperation with the beneficiary RECs, three regional trainings (2009 and 2010) aiming at transferring RBM tools and methodologies to the Staff RECs as well as to Staff from the national/regional Trade Support Institutions (TSI) involved in the implementation of the PACT II program.

Further to these learning experiences participants have expressed their interest in receiving a manual consolidating all the concepts and case studies covered during the trainings to use on a day-today basis as a practical guide to design, implement and monitor projects and programmes.

This manual represents the outcome of the joint effort of the REC staff, participating TSIs and ITC to produce a comprehensive, pragmatic and useful guide for RBM tools and operations. This manual is accompanied by a CD Rom with presentations as well Project management tools and useful templates used during the training.

The ITC wish to express its sincere appreciation to the three RECs, the TSIs involved in this exercise and the participants who have attended the trainings for supporting ITC in the production of this RBM Manual. The findings, interpretations and conclusions expressed do not necessarily reflect the views of ITC, the United Nations or the Regional Economic Communities.
Chapter 1 - Introduction

1. Overview – ITC & PACT II

ITC

Since 1964, the International Trade Centre has helped the business sectors of developing and transition economies to develop exports. Its goal is to help these countries to achieve sustainable human development through exports, with an emphasis on competitiveness, encouragement of partnerships and fostering innovation.

ITC is a joint technical cooperation agency of the UN Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) and WTO, concentrating on business aspects of trade development. While UNCTAD and WTO work principally with governments, ITC works mainly with the business community.

PACT II

Within the context of regional integration, CIDA’s Programme for Building African Capacity for Trade II (PACT II) strengthens the support capacity of relevant regional and national institutions to enhance the export competitiveness, market linkages and, finally, export revenues of African SMEs in high-potential sectors. It constitutes a successor initiative to the PACT I, which was started in 2003 under the Canada-fund for Africa. To build on synergies between country programmes and capitalise on crossborder trade linkages, the successor programme places an enhanced focus on regional integration and institution building: it therefore works with three Regional Economic Communities (RECs) – COMESA, ECCAS and ECOWAS.

African regional integration is critical for the economic development of the continent and holds substantial potential for poverty reduction. Within the spirit of NEPAD’s overarching vision, pro-poor economic growth must be led by the private sector and rooted in increased regional and inter-regional trade. While Africa’s RECs have gone a long way in establishing free trade areas and in some cases are progressing towards customs unions, the success at policy and regulatory level is yet to translate fully into increased intra-regional trade flows. At the same time, new opportunities arise in emerging markets providing greater potential for South-South cooperation.

It is increasingly recognized that the implementation of Africa’s regional integration agendas requires appropriate institutional capacities to guide and support the economic operators at enterprise level, within a common regional framework. Accordingly, regional trade development and promotion has become a critical priority of all RECs, next to their traditional trade policy functions. The linkage between policy and regulatory efforts on the one hand, and trade development and enterprise support, on the other, requires however an institutional middle field of private and public service providers, which is often missing or ineffective.

The key challenge is to upgrade and network these institutions, to enable them to effectively develop the necessary supply response at sector and enterprise levels, by promoting complementarities along the regional value chains, upgrading product quality and design, promoting compliance with standards, improving marketing skills, and facilitating export linkages.

The focus of PACT II is therefore an integrated build-up of trade development capacity at regional and national levels, aligning policy level interventions by the RECs, with practical business facilitation and support provided by the meso-level institutions, and ultimately supporting their practical application at enterprise level.
With regards to RBM, CIDA has been working with RBM for the past 30 years. Its most recent policy on RBM has been updated in June 2008. CIDA uses RBM to better manage its international development programming from start (investment or project analysis, planning, design, implementation, monitoring, adjusting, and reporting) to finish (final evaluations and reports, and integrating lessons learned into future programming).

**Purpose of the RBM Manual**

The RBM Manual was created to present RBM from theory to practice in planning, implementation, monitoring and reporting, with a common set of tools to manage programs and projects for results. Users may include the following:

- Regional Economic Community managers and staff working on programs and projects linked to PACT II or other trade projects.
- National and regional institutions for the joint development of Trade Development & Promotion (TDP) programmes.
- Stakeholders and partners of RECs including Trade Associations, and Chambers of Commerce.

**Note on terminology**

The usage of results-based management terminology in this Manual corresponds to the definitions provided in the OECD DAC'S Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management. A copy of this glossary is included in Appendix I.

This Manual is intended to serve the needs of both project and program managers within the RECs and their implementing partners from the countries concerned. In this Manual, the word “project” is intended to refer to both REC projects and programmes, except where explicitly noted.

**What’s in the Manual?**

A number of Planning, Workplanning and Reporting tools are provided in this manual. These include:

- The Stakeholder Analysis
- The Problem Tree
- The Results Matrix and Logframe
- Sample monitoring tools such as The Performance Measurement Framework (PMF). The Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) and others.

In addition, some practical exercises will help the user to better understand the practical applications of the RBM approach and techniques. Conceived as learning and capacity building tool, each chapter of this manual is accompanied by a power point presentation summarizing the key concepts and objectives. These tools will enable project manager to easily train new staff/partners to the RBM methodology and therefore ensure consistency and sustainability despite staff turnover.

Finally, accompanying this manual, users will be able to find a selection off templates-tools such as logframes, work-plan etc. that could be used to facilitate project design and implementation according to RBM structures and principles.
How the Manual was developed?

The majority of the terms and tools presented in this manual are applicable for a wide audience of development practitioners and public sector specialists interested in RBM. In particular, this manual was developed for an audience of international trade specialists, for that reason, many of the examples cited are linked to international trade.

The material is a synthesis of the tools, policies, and practices of a number of donor agencies, as well as the World Bank and the United Nations. Illustrations drawn from individual donor or UN approaches are used throughout the paper. However, this is by no means a comprehensive survey of existing RBM tools. Additional sources of information are provided throughout the manual to point readers to useful sources for further reading.

Icons used in this manual

- Terminology and definitions
- Practical examples linking RBM with International Trade
- Reference to additional electronic documents and tools
- RBM tools
Chapter 2 - Introducing Results Based Management

1. What is Results-Based Management

While a number of key RBM tools, including the Logical Framework, have been around since the 1960s, much of the recent impetus towards RBM in a development context stems from a period of government reform within the OECD countries. During the 1990s, many of the OECD countries had undertaken extensive public sector reforms in response to economic, social and political pressures, including budget deficits, structural problems, growing competitiveness and globalization. Popular catch phrases such as "Reinventing government", "Doing more with less", "Demonstrating value for money", etc. describe the movement towards public sector reforms that had become prevalent in many of the OECD countries. Government-wide legislation or executive orders drove and guided the public sector reforms. While there have been variations in the reform packages implemented in the OECD countries, there are also many common aspects found in most countries, for example:

- Focus on performance issues (e.g. efficiency, effectiveness, quality of services).
- Devolution of management authority and responsibility.
- Orientation to customer needs and preferences.
- Participation by stakeholders.
- Reform of budget processes and financial management systems.

As was the case more broadly for the public sector of the OECD countries, the development co-operation agencies had faced considerable external pressures to reform their management systems to become more effective and results-oriented. "Aid fatigue", the public's perception that aid programs are failing to produce significant development results, declining aid budgets, and government-wide reforms have all contributed to these agencies' recent efforts to establish results based management systems.

In the sphere of international development, RBM was designed in response to the realization that much development programming reported primarily on outputs produced rather than outcomes achieved. In trade development, for example, reports on programme performance might have proclaimed that a certain number of policies had been promulgated as part of a trade policy programme, without reporting on how those trade policies might have influenced, for example, the customs delays at ports or between land borders. Since bilateral or multilateral agencies would typically hand out funds to executing agencies and governments to carry out trade programming, donors would have no knowledge of the end results of development programmes beyond what was contained in the reports of programme implementers and monitors.

---

1 These terms will be presented in more detail in Chapter 4.
Donor agencies broadly agree on the definition, purposes, and key features of results based management. The basic purposes of results based management systems in the donor community are to generate and use performance information for accountability reporting to external stakeholder audiences and for internal management learning and decision-making. The review of experiences carried out by the OECD would suggest that most agencies’ results based management systems include the following processes or phases:

1. **Formulating objectives**: Identifying in clear, measurable terms the results being sought and developing a conceptual framework for how the results will be achieved.

2. **Identifying indicators**: For each objective, specifying exactly what is to be measured along a scale or dimension.

3. **Setting targets**: For each indicator, specifying the expected or planned levels of result to be achieved by specific dates, which will be used to judge performance.

4. **Monitoring results**: Developing performance monitoring systems to regularly collect data on actual results achieved.

5. **Reviewing and reporting results**: Comparing actual results vis-à-vis the targets (or other criteria for making judgments about performance).

6. **Integrating evaluations**: Conducting evaluations to provide complementary information on performance not readily available from performance monitoring systems.

7. **Using performance information**: Using information from performance monitoring and evaluation sources for internal management learning and decision-making, and for external reporting to stakeholders on results achieved. Effective use generally depends upon putting in place various organizational reforms, new policies and procedures, and other mechanisms or incentives.

The first three phases or processes generally relate to a results-oriented planning approach, sometimes referred to as strategic planning. The first five together are usually included in the concept of performance measurement. All seven phases combined are essential to an effective results based management system. That is, integrating complementary information from both evaluation and performance measurement systems and ensuring management's use of this information are viewed as critical aspects of results based management. (See Exhibit 2.1.)
Figure 1: OECD Aspects of Results Based Management

1. FORMULATING OBJECTIVES
2. IDENTIFYING INDICATORS
3. SETTING TARGETS
4. MONITORING RESULTS
5. REVIEWING AND REPORTING RESULTS
6. INTEGRATING EVALUATION
7. USING PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Understanding inter-linkages and dependencies between planning, monitoring and evaluation

Without proper planning and clear articulation of intended results, it is not clear what should be monitored and how; hence monitoring cannot be done well.

Without effective planning (clear results frameworks), the basis for evaluation is weak; hence evaluation cannot be done well.

Without careful monitoring, the necessary data is not collected; hence evaluation cannot be done well.

Monitoring is necessary, but not sufficient, for evaluation.

Monitoring facilitates evaluation, but evaluation uses additional new data collection and different frameworks for analysis.

Monitoring and evaluation of a programme will often lead to changes in programme plans. This may mean further changing or modifying data collection for monitoring purposes.

*UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results*
The Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) defines RBM as “a means to improve management effectiveness and accountability by involving key stakeholders in defining realistic expected results, assessing risk, monitoring progress toward the achievement of expected results, integrating lessons learned into management decisions and reporting on performance. Fundamentally, RBM is focussed on two different elements: information generation and use. Information generation involves collecting data on the performance of the programme, initiative or organization and analyzing that data to arrive at a greater understanding of what results are being achieved. The second side is the use of the information, which relates to performance information – learning and accountability. Learning is the use of information to inform decision-making, set policy or in some other way improve the programme, initiative or organization.

Thinking of RBM as strictly “monitoring for results” – the traditional task of programme monitoring, with a particular focus on results, is too narrow a definition because it tends to overemphasize the accountability component and under-emphasize the learning potential at programme level. It over-emphasizes the information generation side of RBM at the expense of the use of that information, as shown in #6 and #7 in the Exhibit above.

Results based management at different organizational levels

Performance measurement, and results based management more generally, takes place at different organizational or management levels within the donor agencies. The first level, which has been established the longest and for which there is most experience, is at the project level. More recently, efforts have been underway in some of the donor agencies to establish country program level performance measurement and management systems within their country offices or operating units. Moreover, establishing performance measurement and management systems at the third level -- the corporate or agency-wide level -- is now taking on urgency in many donor agencies as they face increasing public pressures and new government-wide legislation or directives to report on agency performance. (Binnendijk 2000)

Some agencies have manuals on RBM that fail to mention the word “accountability” in them RBM really encompasses “monitoring for results”, evaluation, and any other activity designed to improve accountability and learning in a programming context based on a focus on results. According to the World Bank, a results-based measurement system and related processes of monitoring and evaluation is a necessary, but not sufficient, condition for successful results-based management. Other aspects of management strategy, such as strategic planning and human resource performance management should also be included in RBM.

2. Recent Initiatives Supporting RBM

Recent initiatives put forward by the OECD, World Bank and United Nations are pushing helping to push governments and the development community to adopt public management systems that show results. This has been articulated in a number of agreements, which made explicit commitment to increasing the impact of aid.
Millennium Development Goals

In September 2000, building upon a decade of major United Nations conferences and summits, world leaders came together at United Nations Headquarters in New York to adopt the United Nations Millennium Declaration, committing their nations to a new global partnership to reduce extreme poverty and setting out a series of time-bound targets - with a deadline of 2015 - that have become known as the Millennium Development Goals.

Since 2000, projects and development interventions became increasingly results-focused, via achieving the MDG goals.

Monterrey consensus on Aid Financing

In 2002, at the International Conference on Financing for Development in Monterrey, development partners agreed to focus on managing for development results, an approach that advocated a stronger orientation of monitoring systems towards development results. This approach shifts the emphasis towards identifying what changes, especially benefits have been achieved directly or indirectly by development interventions, as well as measuring what has been done. Ongoing review, assessment and learning were prioritised equally with end of project evaluation. For this to happen, it was emphasized that M&E issues be addressed from the project inception and that good M&E systems are incorporated at all levels of reporting and are closely linked to Project Cycle Management (PCM) practices. A commitment to managing for development results caused bilateral, multilateral and national organizations to review how the practice of M&E could achieve greater consistency, comparability and aid effectiveness. Some development partners, such as GTZ, revised their M&E terminology and frames referring to ‘results oriented M&E' to encourage a focus on results at all stages of an intervention.

The Paris Declaration

Endorsed in March 2005, The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness was an international agreement to which over one hundred Ministers, Heads of Agencies and other Senior Officials adhered and committed their countries and organizations to continue to increase efforts in harmonization, alignment and managing aid for results with a set of monitorable actions and indicators. This Declaration further emphasized the concept of Managing for Development Results.

Accra Agenda for Action

Four years later in Accra, a further engagement was made by Ministers, Heads of Agencies and others to re-affirm their commitment to the Paris principles. Additionally, parties to the Accra Agenda for Action committed to Strengthening Country Ownership over Development, Building More Effective and Inclusive Partnerships for Development and Delivering and Accounting for Development Results.

Main donors thus required the identification (and later delivery) of expected results. The design of projects with clear objectives and indicators that can measure results is therefore fundamental.

MDGs and International Trade?

Goal 8 - Develop a global partnership for development, covers a number of issues, of which international trade is one. Target 8.A calls for the development of an open, rule-based, predictable, and non-discriminatory trading and financial system. Target 8.B addresses the special needs of the least-developed countries, specifically including tariff and quota-free access for least-developed countries’ exports.

Indicator 8.6: Proportion of total developed country imports (by value and excluding arms) from developing countries and from LDCs, admitted free of duty

Indicator 8.7: Average tariffs imposed by developed countries on agricultural products and textiles and clothing from developing countries
Results based Management at the ITC

The ITC, in its effort to mainstream RBM and provide services for its clients, developed a number of internal and external tools to incorporate RBM in its programming. One external tool is a checklist for RBM, which provides Trade Support Institutions with a practical self-diagnostic tool. Trade Support Institutions (TSIs) and others can assess either their existing system or determine if their planned assessment tool meets a set of criteria identified as critical to its success.

The checklists are geared towards TSIs (including Trade Promotion Organisations, Chambers of Commerce etc.). According to ITC, RBM provides institutions (and their clients) with means of:

- Learning from past experiences
- Improving service delivery
- Planning and allocation of resources
- Demonstrating results to key stakeholders

Additional Resources

- Paris Declaration and Accra Agenda for Action: http://www.oecd.org/document/18/0,3343,en_2649_3236398_35401554_1_1_1_1,00.html
- Millennium Development Goal 8:  http://www.mdg-trade.org/

On-Line Resources

- Powerpoint Presentation – Module 1
Chapter 3 - Design Tools for RBM

1. Results Based Planning

As presented in Chapter 2, RBM encompasses planning, monitoring and evaluation and reporting. Results based programme or project planning comes at the start of the project cycle. The purpose of results-based planning is to:

- Establish the results (short-term, medium-term and long-term) that an intervention will aim to achieve
- Define the project strategies, activities, and management structure that will support the results identified, and identify the challenges and constraints that could affect results achievement
- Define a performance measurement approach that will enable internal and external stakeholders to assess progress towards the established results.

Results-based planning tools are used to plan, and later to monitor and evaluate a project or programme within a wider RBM framework. They help in planning the result framework, developing effective presentations, and enabling sharing of information among stakeholders. For many, the learning and sharing elements of RBM are as important as the results themselves. The following tools, usually done in sequence, may be used for the initial planning of project or programmes. These include:

- **Stakeholder Analysis** – a tool to identify the interests and needs of groups, as well as their capabilities in relation to planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation
- **Problem and Objectives Analysis** – a tool to analyze the current situation with regard to a specific development problem.
- **Results chain** – a tool that outlines the logical linkages among several levels of results, inputs and activities
- **Logframe** – a technical tool for summarizing all relevant information related to a project. It captures the clear, expected results, performance indicators, as well as assumptions and challenges. A logframe is usually presented as a matrix.

These tools are often linked to the Logical Framework Approach – which is concerned with problem analysis, the development of objectives and indicators and the identification of risks and assumptions, which feed into the logframe matrix. In general, this process should be a participatory one, involving key stakeholders in order to reach consensus on an intervention, which is then summarized in a logical framework.

**Results-based project planning is conducted through the following processes:**

* Identifying the development objective and the stakeholders
* Clarifying the interventions in terms of outputs outcomes, and impacts
* Defining strategies to realize results with the help of the results chain and Logframe
* Defining methods to monitor and evaluate the achievement of results
The Logical Framework Approach tools are also covered in Module 2 of the PowerPoint Presentations that accompany this Manual. The Results Chain and the Logframe are covered in Chapters 4-7, as well as in Modules 3-6 of the PowerPoint Presentations.

It should be noted that the Logframe, while conceived at the project appraisal stage or in initial planning of a project or intervention, is equally applicable as a tool at the project implementation phase, as well as during the reporting, monitoring and evaluation. This will be discussed further in Chapter 4.

**Figure 2: Design Tools for Results Based Management**

![Diagram of Design Tools for Results Based Management]

2. Planning Development Interventions

The RBM design tools are used primarily in development interventions – both projects and programmes. A project is a set of activities undertaken to achieve an objective or set of objectives, with discrete (defined) starting and ending dates. A project is a relatively short-term intervention undertaken to achieve a medium- to long-term change. A programme is a set of activities undertaken to achieve an objective or set of objectives, with no discrete ending date.

Development projects are designed in response to (or to address) a development problem or constraint. Frequently the problem relates to a public service that is inadequate or lacking, such as the lack of export rules and regulations, inexistent trade promotion policies, or inadequate customs regulations to facilitate exports. In many cases, there is a consensus that the situation is unsatisfactory and requires change. The current situation, by definition, is unsatisfactory as regards the central development problem or constraint, as shown in Exhibit 3.2.

Stakeholder Analysis and Problem Analysis are two tools used to diagnose this unsatisfactory situation. Since the current situation is, by definition, unsatisfactory, presumably there can be a future desired situation, in which the central development problem and its related causes and effects are addressed and ameliorated. Hence, one of the ways to foster or promote the change from the current situation to a future desired situation is through a short-term intervention called a project. Objectives Analysis and Analysis of Alternatives are two additional tools used to specify the future desired situation.
3. The Stakeholder Analysis

Stakeholder Analysis is often used as a starting point of any project design workshop, which should include representatives of the various groups of stakeholders. The OECD define “stakeholders” as “Agencies, organizations, groups or individuals who have a direct or indirect interest in the development intervention or its evaluation” Stakeholders are those affected, positively or negatively, directly or indirectly, by the development problem and its possible solution. For example:

- People affected by the problem.
- People who can influence the problem.
- Groups, organizations or individuals with interests in a means of addressing the problem.
- Those who are affected by a decision or who can affect the decision regarding the problem.

If the key groups of stakeholders are properly identified, then the design can include actions to maximize support and minimize resistance to project implementation. (Example: projects that can have environmental consequences.)

This is particularly important for community-level projects or where cooperation and participation of beneficiaries is crucial to success. In fact, a strong sense of “ownership” at the community level can help a project survive changes in conditions, such as in government priorities, etc.

Sometimes it is useful to develop a classification of types of groups to facilitate the identification of a project's key stakeholders. For example:
• Population (adults, youth, seniors, rural v. urban, etc.)
• Public sector agencies (central government, police or constabulary, etc.)
• Private sector (chambers of trade or commerce, large corporations, trade unions, cooperatives)
• Civil Society Organizations and Non-Governmental Organizations – NGOs (associations, human rights organizations, environmental groups, etc.)
• Religious organizations (churches and groups of a religious nature influential in the community)
• Political groups (parties, associations, etc.)
• External organizations (international organizations, bilateral agencies, international NGO’s, other countries, etc.)
• Contributors and financial supporters

The identification of the specific stakeholders will depend on the current situation and circumstances, as well as the nature of the project. For example, in a trade promotion project, we may include individual exporters, the Ministry of Trade, the chamber of commerce, trade associations, etc. External stakeholders such as the world Trade Organization (WTO) and the World Bank may also be stakeholders, as they have specific interests in given strategies. Key trading partners may also be stakeholders, depending on the recipient industries of the trade promotion policies.

### Figure 4: Sample Outline of Stakeholder Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Interests</th>
<th>Problems Perceived</th>
<th>Resources Mandates</th>
<th>Potential Conflicts</th>
<th>Interest in a Given Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Stakeholder Analysis helps to identify:

Interests and needs of the groups, as well as their capabilities in relation to planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation.

- Groups that can be directly involved at different stages of a project.
- Changes in practices or attitudes that are required, desirable and feasible from the point of view of the project’s final beneficiary group(s), such as:
  - Part of the population (producers, consumers).
  - An organization (ministry, public or private entity, union, NGO).
  - Social groups (children, women, indigenous population, the disabled, etc.).

### How to carry out a Stakeholder Analysis

**Columns of a stakeholder analysis may include the following:**

- **Group:** Identify the groups (not individuals) directly or indirectly involved in or affected, positively or negatively, by the development problem and its possible solution. It is vital to include stakeholder groups that are in favour or opposed to a proposed solution. A group in support may contribute to a project’s resources if it addresses its problem adequately; a group opposed may use its resources to block or impede project approval or implementation.
- **Interests:** Each group has its own particular interests in relation to the development problem. Interests may reflect possible solutions suggested by groups that are negatively affected by the development problem.
- **Problems Perceived:** Identify each group’s perceptions of the difficulties that give rise to, or result from, the development problem. Problems should be stated as negative conditions, and be clear and unambiguous. Avoid identifying the lack of a solution as “the problem”. This is discussed in further detail in the next section.
Tip: The Contents of the Problems Perceived Column can be used as inputs to the Problem Tree

- **Resources:** Financial and non-financial contributions that each group can make in support of or in opposition to a proposed solution.
- They can be political, legal, human (e.g., volunteer work), financial, non-financial. Examples of non-financial resources: voting, strikes, public opinion, labour force, influence, pressure groups.
- **Mandates:** Formal organizations – such as those that have charters (and mission statements) – have legal or statutory authority to use their resources for specified purposes – perhaps in connection with the central problem.
- **Potential Conflicts:** There could be existing or potential conflicts among groups of stakeholders. (This can be useful to identify project assumptions/risks.)
- **Interests in a Strategy:** Once a project strategy is developed, some groups will be strongly in favour of it, while others will be less so, and some will oppose the project.

The last two columns of the stakeholder analysis table should be completed as the decision to undertake a particular strategy is being made.

**Things to consider to ensure participation in the Stakeholder Analysis**

- Why?
- When? How does it fit?
- Who and how many?
- Where?
- What expectations? Outputs?
- How participatory?
- Who facilitates? What is the role of facilitator?
- Cost?
- Agenda?
- Logistics?
- Follow-up?

**Participation for Stakeholder Analysis**

**Advantages of Participation**

- **Efficiency** – Beneficiaries and other agents work in tandem to achieve results.
- **Effectiveness** – People’s participation can make projects more effective by granting them a say in deciding the results and strategies, and by participating in implementation.
- **Self-reliance** – Instead of creating a “dependence syndrome,” it can increase awareness, self-confidence, and control of the development process.
- **Coverage** – Participation by target groups can ensure that the project’s benefits are available for wider coverage of weaker members of society.
- **Sustainability** – Participation can encourage “ownership” which is necessary for a continued flow of benefits.

**Obstacles to Participation**

- **Structural Obstacles** – Factors that form part of centralized political systems typified by a “top-down” approach and not oriented towards participation.
- **Administrative Obstacles** – Administrative structures that are control-oriented, operated by sets of guidelines and adopting a blue-print approach, providing little space for participation.
- **Social Obstacles** – Mentality of dependence, culture of silence, domination by local elites, and gender inequality militate against people’s participation.
Sample Stakeholder Analysis in International Trade:

Below is a stakeholder analysis carried out to review implications of a trade policy on a number of stakeholders. The last two columns are left blank, to be filled in once options on the trade policy have been defined. The last two columns may not be done later in the process.

**Figure 5: Sample Stakeholder Analysis for International Trade Policies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Interests</th>
<th>Problems Perceived</th>
<th>Resources (R) &amp; Mandates (M)</th>
<th>Potential Conflicts</th>
<th>Interest in (Given) Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exporters</td>
<td>Efficient and fair access to international customers and markets</td>
<td>Frequent delays at border, Prohibitive tariffs on imports in many countries, High export taxes, Inconsistent application of export rules, Customs offices are unreliable</td>
<td>R – Willingness to pay reasonable taxes and fees for improved services, M – Not applicable</td>
<td>Frustrated with additional paperwork demanded by customs officers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>Improved business environment for members and an opportunity to influence</td>
<td>Bureaucracy hinders small business creation, Export paperwork is cumbersome, Costly delays in handling exports at borders and ports</td>
<td>R – Can mobilize businesses to support policy changes, M – to represent the interest of businesses and exporters</td>
<td>Frustrated with additional paperwork demanded by customs officers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Ministry of Trade</td>
<td>Improved Balance of Trade and compliance of international trade rules and regulations</td>
<td>Lack of resources to properly oversee trade policy, Developed countries inhibit value-added exports from developing countries, No WTO membership, Poor export infrastructure</td>
<td>R – Budget for policies and staffing, R – Experience in policy making, M – To represent interests of country</td>
<td>Frustrated by Ministry of Finance budgetary constraints</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customs Offices</td>
<td>Accurate records of the movement of goods in and out of the country as well as associated taxes and fees.</td>
<td>Outdated infrastructure, Systems not yet fully computerized, Unmotivated staff and poor salaries, Lack of means of supervision between HQ and border customs offices</td>
<td>R – staff and offices, R – Vehicle fleet, R – Operating budget, M – To control the import and export of goods as well as administer associated fees, taxes and levies</td>
<td>Lack authority and independence from Ministry of Trade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders</td>
<td>Interests</td>
<td>Problems Perceived</td>
<td>Resources (R) &amp; Mandates (M)</td>
<td>Potential Conflicts</td>
<td>Interest in (Given) Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| World Trade Organization and other international trade bodies              | Enhance global trade and concomitant prosperity while ensuring participation and fairness | • Poor trade policy and governance in some countries  
• Low capacity to administer rules and laws consistently in some countries  
• Inequality in the global trade rules  
• Low capacity in trade negotiation | R – Allocates budget resources to support trade policy development in some countries  
R – Expertise on trade policy decisions  
M – To serve the interests all actors in global trade | None | |

Revisiting the Stakeholder Analysis

Once a strategy has been defined, it may be necessary to review the stakeholder analysis in order to review the stakeholders and the final two columns. These columns will help to identify risks and a management structure in a given strategy.

How to carry out a Stakeholder Importance and Influence Matrix for a small business export programme

The stakeholder importance and influence matrix is another element of the stakeholder analysis, and is a tool used to determine who should be involved in the planning session and how other stakeholders should be engaged in the overall process.

**Group 1** stakeholders are very important to the success of the activity but may have little influence on the process. For example, the success of a small business export programme project will often depend on how well women’s artisanal groups are able to participate in the programme, but in some countries these groups may not have much influence on the design and implementation of the project. In this case, they are highly important but not very influential. They may require special emphasis to ensure that their interests are protected and that their voices are heard.

**Group 2** stakeholders are central to the planning process as they are both important and influential. These should be key stakeholders for partnership building. For example, trade associations involved in a business development may be both very important (as mobilizers of small businesses) and influential (without their support the programme may not be possible).

**Group 3** stakeholders are not the central stakeholders for an initiative and have little influence on its success or failure. They are unlikely to play a major role in the overall process. One example could be an international NGO group that has little influence on the project. Similarly, they are not the intended beneficiaries of, and will not be impacted by, the programme.

**Group 4** stakeholders are not very important to the activity but may exercise significant influence. For example, an informal political leader may not be an important stakeholder for a small business programme aimed at increasing exports, but she or he could have major influence on the process due to informal relations with power brokers and ability to mobilize people or influence public opinion. These stakeholders can sometimes create constraints to programme implementation or may be able to stop all activities. Even if they are not involved in the planning process, there may need to be a strategy for communicating with these stakeholders and gaining their support.

Based on the stakeholder analysis, and on what is practicable given cost and location of various stakeholders, the identified stakeholders should be brought together in a planning workshop or meeting.
Figure 6: Stakeholder Register (Simple)—Grid

- Group 1: High Importance/Low Influence Stakeholders
- Group 2: High Importance/High Influence Stakeholders
- Group 3: Low Importance/Low Influence Stakeholders
- Group 4: Low Importance/High Influence Stakeholders
It should be noted that in some instances, as a project or programme is being developed, new stakeholders will emerge. In the example provided, if the “project or intervention” were to propose drastic reform of the Ministry of Trade, the union representing the employees of the Ministry might become a key stakeholder, as it would have a clear interest in the proposed intervention. In many projects that involve environmental factors, the presentation of potential interventions brings out many new stakeholder groups, particularly those who might be directly affected by the intervention.

In completing the stakeholder analysis, one should note that the last two columns may not be directly completed at the time of the initial stakeholder analysis. Once a number of alternative interventions are presented, each may have a separate stakeholder analysis with the last two columns completed at that time.

Finally, stakeholder analysis provides useful information that may feed into the fourth column of the logframe – Assumptions and Risks.

4. Problem Analysis

The second diagnostic tool we use is **Problem Analysis**. Through the development of a diagram called a “Problem Tree,” this technique is an important aid to understanding the central problem. The central problem to be addressed by a project must be identified correctly in order to design the most appropriate strategy (solution alternatives). In other words, it is not possible to reach a satisfactory solution to a central problem if we do not make a reasonable effort to understand it, especially its causes and its effects.

Problem Analysis considers the negative conditions perceived by the stakeholders in connection with the central problem, and arranges the principal problems according to their cause-and-effect relationships, thereby clarifying the objectives upon which the project should focus.

In the Figure shown below, the one box on the second level would correspond to the central problem under consideration. The three boxes below it, on the third level, are problems that are its three main causes, while the two (2) boxes on the first level are problems that are its main effects.

For example, a central problem could be “Low export diversification.” Its main causes could be “absence of transformation plants” and “scarcity of qualified entrepreneurs and artisans.” “Absence of value added industries and products” could be caused by “absence of collateral and difficult access to credit,” while “scarcity of qualified entrepreneurs” could be caused by “inadequate vocational training” and “inadequate tertiary education.” The main effect of “Low export diversification” could be “low employment and highly vulnerable households.”

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem Analysis is a tool to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Analyze the current situation with regard to a specific development problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Identify the main problems around this central development problem and their cause-effect relationships and interrelationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Visualize the cause-effect relationships in a “problem tree” diagram.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Help establish the “logic model” on which a programme or project will be based.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 7: Outline of a Problem Tree

Sample Problem Tree for International Trade

Figure 8: Problem Tree Example: Low export Diversification
How to carry out a Problem Analysis

The following steps are needed to carry out a Problem Analysis in a participatory setting:

- Identify the main ("central") problem and place it at the top. (This may have emerged from the stakeholder analysis.) If in a workshop setting, write the central problem on a card, place it at the upper center for consideration by the stakeholders, and modify it appropriately in order to achieve consensus.

- Identify the other problems perceived by the stakeholders that are direct causes of the central problem (which becomes an effect) and place them right below the central problem.

- Examples of "Hidden Solutions". For example: "We do not have a microfinance institutions." Instead: "enterprises has difficulties to access credit." "There are no quality or packaging institutes." Instead: "goods are often returned to the producer because of the uneven quality or inadequate packaging."

- Continue placing other problems perceived that are causes of the problems recently placed until you reach very specific "root" problems. (Working to address these "root problems" tends to increase a project's sustainability.) As a general principle, all problems perceived by stakeholders are valid, provided they do not constitute "hidden solutions," although this does not mean that all problems must be placed in the diagram.

- Determine if any perceived problems are effects of the development problem and place them above the central problem.

- Show cause - effect relationships (by drawing lines with arrows).

- Review the tree and verify its completeness and validity.

Problem tree diagrams can be used for a variety of purposes, both in the public and private sphere. For example, in risk assessment and management, important risks have causes and effects; risk avoidance addresses the causes whereas mitigation addresses the effects.
Sample Problem Tree for International Trade

Figure 9: Problem Tree Example: Low Growth in Agricultural Exports

5. Objectives Analysis

In Analysis of Objectives, or Objectives Tree, the problems identified in the Problem Tree are converted into objectives or solutions, as part of the initial phase of specifying the “future desired situation” and designing an appropriate intervention.

The objectives that are identified as the Outputs of a project – which frequently are the solutions to the problems identified as direct causes of the central problem – become the means for addressing the central problem and provide a means to assess performance.

Since the Objectives Tree shows means-ends relationships, it is easiest to begin at the top of the Problem Tree – and convert those problems to solutions – ends – and then work down to the means for achieving those ends. In converting problems to solutions, we write them in a way that is realistic and achievable. It should also be noted that in the development of a results chain and logical framework, the objectives tree is sometimes avoided, as it is the converse of the problems tree and appears again in the development of the results chain.
How to do an Objective Tree

Taking the example given in the section on the Problem Tree in which the central problem was “Low export diversification.” The objective could be phrased as “Heightened Export diversification.” One of the central problem’s direct causes, “Absence of value-added industries and products” could be changed to the objective “Increased value-added industries and products.” The problem “Scarcity of qualified entrepreneurs and artisans” was caused by “Inadequate vocational training” This could be changed to “New vocational training established,” and we could also add another objective – “state-sponsored artisanal competitions established” as an additional means to achieve “Greater number of entrepreneurs and artisans.”

In the Objectives Tree, what were causes in the Problem Tree become means, and what were effects become ends. The Problem Tree is like the negative of a photograph, while the Objectives Tree is the photograph after it has been developed.

Objectives Analysis serves to underline the importance of developing a complete and valid Problem Tree. It may be necessary to add objectives if relevant and necessary to achieve the proposed objective, or eliminate objectives that do not seem realistic.

![Objectives Tree for International Trade](image)

**Figure 10: Example Objectives Tree for Export Diversification**

**Additional Examples:**
- Problem: Customs delays at border crossings
  - Objective: Delays at border are reduced.
- Problem: Small exporters have no means to reach export markets.
  - Objective: Exporters access to export markets improved.

**Problem:**
- Customs delays at border crossings
- Small exporters have no means to reach export markets.
6. Analysis of Alternatives

In any project, once a central problem has been identified, there are a number of alternative interventions that may be carried out in order to solve the central problem. For example, if the central problem is a weak customs authority, there may be a few potential solutions:

- To re-organize the customs authority administration,
- To decentralize decision making of the customs authority
- To privatize the customs authority.

In the export diversification problem outlined in the examples above, increasing the number of entrepreneurs and artisans could be carried out with government-run education and training programmes, private training programmes or might involve a loan-scheme. Each option represents an alternative, and these would be judged based on a number of criteria and analyses, including cost, total number of beneficiaries, length of time, internal rate of return, economic rate of return, environmental assessment and so on. They may be scored so that one alternative is judged the most appropriate for the intervention.

**Sample Criteria for Assessing and Comparing alternative interventions**

- Total Cost
- Total Number of Beneficiaries
- Internal Rate of Return
- Economic Rate of Return
- Environmental Assessment
How to complete an Analysis of Alternatives

1. Brainstorm the criteria against which the different alternative objectives will be assessed (e.g., expected contribution, benefits, feasibility, cost, IRR, environmental assessment).
2. Identify different alternatives by looking at the level of objectives in the objective tree.
3. Eliminate objectives being pursued by other agencies or organizations or that are not desirable or achievable.
4. Analyse different alternative objectives against the criteria identified above, using scoring or ranking.
5. Select the most suitable strategy for achieving the objective by selecting from the alternatives.

Once the alternatives have been selected, it will also be important to review the stakeholder analysis, particularly the last two columns, where different alternatives may be viewed favourably by different stakeholders.

7. Additional Resources


On-Line Resources:

- Powerpoint Presentation – Module 2
- Microsoft Excel –
- Sample Problem Tree
- Sample Stakeholder Analysis
- Sample Objectives Tree
Chapter 4 - The Logical Framework Approach

1. Overview of the Logical Framework Approach

The Logical Framework Approach was originally developed in military and business contexts in the 1960s and were later adapted for development projects through USAID (US Agency for International Development) in the late 1960’s-early 70’s. In the early 1980’s new elements were incorporated by international development organizations, including UNDP and ILO and also taken on board by several European agencies (including GTZ of Germany, to what became known as the “Logical Framework Approach – or LFA – to project design." ZOPP system used by GTZ, which is the same as the LFA. ZOPP is a German acronym for “objectives-oriented project planning.”). It is one of the principal tools used by development agencies for project design, planning, monitoring, and evaluation. Most development organizations require its use, even though many make adjustments to the logframe to suit their particular needs.

The purpose of the LFA is to organize and give structure to the project planning process and to communicate essential information about a project. It is a technique for managing the entire project cycle, including project identification, preparation, appraisal, presentation to committees for consideration and approval, and facilitates implementation, monitoring, and evaluation.

Two important points should be stressed about the LFA: (1) It is based on the principle of “participatory project design and implementation,” meaning that successful projects tend to be those that are planned and implemented considering the views and interests of the principal stakeholders, including the beneficiaries or target groups, the donors, etc. (2) It is not a static tool, but rather it is modified and improved iteratively, as the project is designed and executed.

Logical framework Matrix (Logframe)

Over the last 30 years, logframes have been used to plan projects and to present them to inside and outside stakeholders. A logframe is a management tool that summarizes the entire project:

- It captures the design of an intervention, most often at the program or project level
- It identifies results (inputs, outputs, outcomes, impact) and their causal relationships, performance indicators, and the challenges and constraints that may influence success
- It facilitates planning, management, monitoring and evaluation of an intervention.

A logframe is typically presented as a matrix with several columns and rows. While there are many different logframe formats, the standard logframe is a 4-column and 4-row matrix that captures the following:

- The Goal and Objectives of the initiative, and results at all levels (impact, medium-term outcomes, short-term outcomes, outputs)
- Performance indicators to measure the progress of each result
- Means of verification that capture the data source for the indicator
- Assumptions and challenges and constraints that may affect achievement of results.
The Log Frame is so named because of the logic processes that underpin its creation and format. This logic is explained and demonstrated through something called the program logic model. This is a way of thinking about how the various components of a project relate to each other to achieve impact and meet goals, and is presented in more detail below.

**Figure 12: Standard 4X4 Logical Framework**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Means of Verification (MOV)</th>
<th>Assumptions and risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Impact Indicators</td>
<td>MoV</td>
<td>Sustainability assumptions and risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Outcome Indicators</td>
<td>MoV</td>
<td>Country level impact assumptions and risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outputs</td>
<td>Output Indicators</td>
<td>MoV</td>
<td>Project Effectiveness Assumptions and Risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Inputs</td>
<td>MoV</td>
<td>Project Execution Assumptions and Risks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strengths of LFM**

It guides a systematic and logical analysis of the key inter-related elements that constitute a well-designed project. Key interrelated elements include the results (outputs, outcomes and impacts) their corresponding indicators and targets, the sources of information to verify performance, principal activities that need to be carried out with the corresponding inputs/resources (budget), and important assumptions.

There are two types of logic inherent in a logframe:

- **Vertical logic** as a hierarchy of objectives – activities deliver outputs, which contribute to outcomes, which should contribute to the overall impact.
- **Horizontal logic** showing how progress against each objective can be assessed (indicators and means of verification) and the external factors (assumptions and risks) which might affect the achievement of objectives at the next level.

It provides the structure to show, in one document, the most important information about a project and to clearly spell out its results. The LFM is a brief, concise document, somewhat similar to an Executive Summary that contains all of the above elements. It facilitates the preparation of a project implementation plan, linking design with execution.

It facilitates understanding and better communication among the stakeholders (administrators, beneficiaries, etc.) Uniform terminology facilitates communication and reduces ambiguity. (“We all speak the same language.”) The small number of key elements, with their corresponding definitions, makes it possible to shorten the time required to explain a project to interested persons. (It also helps ensures continuity of approach when the original project staff is replaced.)

It requires planners to think how the project will be monitored and evaluated, identifying indicators of results during the design stage. Provides information for monitoring and evaluation – in other words, it enhances a project’s evaluability and Quality at Entry. When used for a series of projects, it facilitates comparability.

It requires the identification of assumptions/risks and the critical factors for success. External factors that reflect uncertainty and therefore affect project performance are called Assumptions.
Limitations of LFM

The construction of a project LFM requires time and considerable training in the concept and logic of the approach. The LFM’s apparent simplicity is not to be confused with speed in project design.

There is a danger that specialists and managers use it in a rigid and inflexible manner, not allowing for creativity and innovation. All too often, the LFM is used rigidly, without allowing alterations that are frequently required as a project is being implemented. (The GTZ used to say that on average, the projects they funded had approximately 7 LFMs.) Some project coordinators can become too focused on meeting targets or on measuring indicators, which may lead to a more inflexible approach to implementation – less responsive to changes in the overall environment as the project progresses.

The strong focus on results can miss the opportunity to define and improve processes. Behind the “logic model” lie processes by which activities lead to outputs, outputs to outcomes, and outcomes to impacts. Indeed, these processes can be mapped. There is a need to balance a results-based approach, crucial to reach objectives, with a continuous analysis and improvement of the implementation process.

The Logframe is only one of the tools to be used during project preparation, execution and monitoring, and it does not replace other instruments (i.e. target group analysis, scheduling and WBS, time and resources planning, etc.)

It should be remembered that the Logframe is “policy neutral” on questions such as income distribution, employment opportunities, access to resources, local participation, effects on the environment. A priori, the LFM does not favor special consideration of lower income groups, environmental damage, etc. In that sense, it is a “policy-neutral” tool.

Prerequisites for a LFM

Developing the Logframe should be a collaborative process to engage the views of intended beneficiaries and key stakeholders in the project. The Results-Based LFM implies that the steps were in place to develop and plan for the logframe using the LFA participatory project design and implementation. The Stakeholder Analysis should first be conducted with stakeholders, including beneficiaries. Without participation by a project’s key stakeholders, it is difficult to design a project that responds to their needs as they perceive them (not as seen by the donor community or the project design team).

It should be considered a flexible tool, to be adapted and improved though a project's lifecycle. Many unforeseen things can happen during project design and implementation. To increase the likelihood of success, a project’s LFM must be adapted and updated to reflect changing circumstances. We should not try to adapt a project to the LFM, but rather use the LFA (the Analyses and Matrix) to reflect reality at any given moment (“changing”). In this sense, a project should be considered a learning experience.

Targets and indicators must be periodically revised in response to project implementation and changes in the context and external situation. It is important that we do not confuse planning with being rigid.

Logical Framework can be useful in all phases of the project cycle, including preparation, implementation (when monitoring is also carried out), and in evaluation.
Figure 13: Logical Framework can be used in all phases of a project cycle

Helpful Definitions: Logframes and the Results Chain

Result: The output, outcome, or impact (intended or unintended, positive and/or negative) of a development intervention.

Results chain: The causal sequence for a development intervention that stipulates the necessary sequence to achieve desired objectives beginning with inputs, moving through activities and outputs, and culminating in outcomes, impacts. The results chain is sometimes called a logic model or result framework.

Impacts: Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.

Outcomes: The likely or achieved short- to medium-term effects of an intervention’s outputs.

Outputs: The products, capital goods and services which result from a development intervention; may also include changes resulting from the intervention which are relevant to the achievement of outcomes.

Inputs: The financial, human, and material resources used for the development intervention.

Activities: Actions taken or work performed through which inputs (such as funds, technical assistance and other types of resources) are mobilized to produce specific outputs. Activities turn inputs (human and financial) into outputs.

(OECD DAC)
### Figure 14: Logical Framework Template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPECTED RESULTS</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE INDICATORS</th>
<th>RISKS/ASSUMPTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Impact Indicators</td>
<td>Means of Verification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Outcomes Indicators</td>
<td>Means of Verification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outcome 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output 1.1</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Output Indicator</th>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
<th>Risks/Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activity 1.1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Risk Management Strategy:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activity 1.1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assumptions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activity 1.1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Risk Management Strategy:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 1.2</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Output Indicator</td>
<td>Means of Verification</td>
<td>Risks/Assumptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activity 1.2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Risk Management Strategy:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activity 1.2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assumptions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activity 1.2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Risk Management Strategy:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outcome 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output 2.1</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Output Indicator</th>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
<th>Risks/Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activity 2.1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Risk Management Strategy:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activity 2.1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assumptions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activity 2.1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Risk Management Strategy:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 2.2</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Output Indicator</td>
<td>Means of Verification</td>
<td>Risks/Assumptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activity 2.2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Risk Management Strategy:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activity 2.2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assumptions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activity 2.2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Risk Management Strategy:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. The Results Chain

A results chain, sometimes known as a causal chain, clarifies the logical sequence of outputs and outcomes that are expected to flow from the project activities, and identifies the steps that will demonstrate progress toward their achievement. A results chain serves as a "roadmap" that leads from project activities to outputs to outcomes and impacts. The use of the term results reinforces the view that benefits can be produced throughout the implementation of a given program and not just towards the end of the project period. The different results that are derived from the inputs, activities, outputs, and outcomes of a project are linked through a logical process called a causal impact chain.

The purposes of the results chain are:

- To clarify the linkages among inputs, activities, and results at various levels
- To communicate internally and externally about the rationale, activities, and expected results of the project
- To test whether the project makes sense from a logical perspective
- To provide the foundation for performance measurement and evaluation strategies (i.e., determining what constitutes success).

A results chain usually contains three result levels (impact, outcomes, and outputs) and one process level element (activities), as shown in Exhibit 4.3 below. In the next Exhibit, another results chain is displayed – this one developed in 2008 by CIDA: in this case, rather than use the word “impact”, CIDA proposes “ultimate outcome” In this case, the outcome levels are defined as “developmental results”.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPECTED RESULTS</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE INDICATORS</th>
<th>RISKS/ASSUMPTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 3.1</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Means of Verification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 3.1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 3.1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 3.1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 3.2</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Means of Verification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 3.2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 3.2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 3.2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 15: Results Chain

Impact

Outcomes

Outputs

Activities

Figure 16: CIDA Results Chain

Ultimate Outcome

Intermediate Outcome

Immediate Outcome

Outputs

Activities

Inputs
3. Developing a Results Chain

Despite attempts to clarify and define distinct levels of results in the project logframe, reality is often more complex than any logic model. In reality, there may be many levels of objectives/results in the logical cause-and-effect chain and many results that must happen at each level in order for the cause-effect chain to hold. What exactly does one define as the outputs or outcomes? As shown in the two structures above, different development agencies take somewhat different approaches, varying what they would include in each of the result categories.

Rather than think about categories, it might be more realistic to think about a continuum of results, with outputs at one extreme and goals/impacts at the other extreme. Results along the continuum can be conceptualized as varying along three dimensions -- time, level, and coverage.

**Timeframe:** Results range along a continuum from immediate to medium-term to long-term. Outputs are the most immediate of results, while goals (impacts) are the longest-range, with purpose (outcomes) in the middle or intermediate range.

**Level:** Results also vary along a continuum of cause-effect levels logically related one to the next in a causal chain fashion. Outputs represent the lowest level in the results chain, whereas goals (impacts) represent the highest level, while purpose (outcomes) once again fall somewhere in the middle range. Outputs are physical products or services; outcomes are often described in terms of client preferences, responses or behaviours; impacts are generally defined in terms of the ultimate socio-economic development or welfare conditions being sought.

**Coverage:** A final dimension deals with the breadth of coverage, or who (what target groups) are affected by the change. At one end of the continuum, results may be described narrowly as effects on intermediary organizations or groups, followed by effects on direct beneficiaries or clients. At the other extreme, the results (impacts) usually are defined as more widespread effects on society. Goals tend to be defined more broadly as impacts on a larger target population -- e.g., on a region or even a whole nation, whereas purposes (outcomes) once again refer to narrower effects on project clients only. However, the nature of goals, purposes, and outputs can vary from agency to agency. Some agencies tend to aim "higher" and "broader", defining their project's ultimate goal in terms of significant improvements in welfare at the national level, whereas other agencies tend to choose a "lower" and "narrower" result over which they have a greater influence. The more resources an agency has to bring to bear to a development problem, the more influence it can exert and the higher and broader it might aim. For example, the World Bank might legitimately define its project's goal (impact) in terms of society- or economy-wide improvements, whereas smaller donor agencies might more appropriately aim at district-level or even community-level measures of change.

Results should also indicate the expected change or transformation that is expected at the end of an intervention. The wording should capture the desired state at the end of the project.

Outcomes in a logic model typically describe the consequences of the activities and outputs. They have an action word associated with them (e.g., "increased", "improved").

In the results chain, results statements should be designed so that it is easy to understand what situation will change, who will benefit, and where the change will occur. They should be relevant to the beneficiaries. They should be easy to measure and be achievable within the parameters of the project (time, resources available).

### Outcome results

- Use "action" words
- Improved
- Increased
- Strengthened
- Reduced
- Enhanced

### SMART Results

- Specific
- Measurable
- Achievable
- Relevant
- Time Bound
Figure 17: Checklist for SMART Results and for a Good Results Chain

Checklist for SMART Results

Specific
☐ What: The result states the specific type of change that will occur (individual, organizational, institutional, societal) and/or the specific products or services that will be provided
☐ Who: The result states the specific target group or beneficiary of the intervention
☐ Where: The location or site where the result will occur is stated

Measurable
☐ The result can be measured by either quantitative or qualitative indicators
☐ The type of change is defined clearly enough that appropriate measures will be easily found

Achievable
☐ The result is within the scope of the project’s control or sphere of influence
☐ The result is achievable within the project budget and time period
☐ The duration or timeframe given for the result is appropriate to the type of beneficiary targeted

Relevant
☐ The result addresses identified needs and/or problem(s)
☐ The beneficiaries or target groups were involved in designing this result and/or in giving input into the design of this result

Time-bound
☐ The timeframe when the result will happen is specified

Checklist for a Good Results Chain

Impact
☐ The impact(s) can be realistically achieved
☐ The impact links to one MDGs or an agency or government’s medium-term results
☐ Long-term changes at the societal level clearly identified
☐ Widest target group or group of beneficiaries

Outcomes
☐ Proposed changes are realistic in the time frame (1-3 years for a project, 1-5 years for a program)
☐ The types of expected change are clearly stated
☐ Achievement of the combination of outcomes will contribute to achievement of the impact

Outputs
☐ Proposed changes are realistic in the time frame
☐ Outputs support achievement of the outcome
☐ Deliverables (products) are clearly identified
☐ Narrower group of beneficiaries

Activities
☐ Activities are necessary and sufficient to achieve the outputs
Agricultural Products Trade Project

The long-term goal of the Agricultural Products Trade Project (APTP) is to develop cross-boundary trade in agricultural products, thus enhancing food security in areas where yield is low due to drought, environmental problems, or diversion of water resources.

The purpose of the APTP is to create the Nile Basin Agriculture Forum (AF), an institution that will coordinate the development of cross-boundary agricultural markets among the Nile Basin countries.

Once created, the Agriculture Forum will support dialogue and special studies to explore a range of policy-related issues, including institutional and regulatory frameworks for trade and mechanisms for poverty reduction.

In support of this purpose, the project activities for APTP focus on the institutionalization and operation of the Agriculture Forum.

A needs’ assessment found that the following were required to establish an effective Forum: a long-term strategy, a financial management system, an appropriate organizational structure, an adequate infrastructure, and trained experts in agriculture to take part in the Forum.

The results chain below shows how the various activities of the project lead to its expected results.

---

2 Source: Nile Basin Initiative
Figure 19: Example of a Results Chain with Multiple results and levels

4. From Results Chain to Logframe – The First Column

The results chain that has been developed using the tools presented in Chapter 3 as well as in the previous sections of Chapter 4 fits within the first column of the logframe:

In Column 1 of the Logframe enter the following results:

- Goal – the overall goal should be one of the country’s or region’s principle objectives or contribute to one of the MDGs.
- Impact – the impact statement from the results chain, which should correspond to the goal of the project
- Objectives – identify the project objectives that lead to the goal
- Corresponding outcomes – enter the outcome and output statements from the results chain. Each outcome should be associated with one of the objectives.
- Outputs – identify the outputs required to achieve each outcome
- Activities/Inputs – identify the main activities that will lead to each output. These activities do not need indicators associated with them.
Inputs
“The financial, human, and material resources used for the development intervention.”

Activities
“Actions taken or work performed through which inputs, such as funds, technical assistance and other types of resources are mobilized to produce specific outputs.”

Outputs
Outputs are the “deliverables.” If you are a construction company, contracted to build a road, the road is your Output – your deliverable. If you are a training organization and you are contracted to provide a skills training course, the course is your Output – your deliverable.

All Output statements should include strong, action verbs that suggest a “turn-key” approach, meaning that all requirements for people to use the Outputs have been included -- installed and in operation; built and open to the public; educational materials printed and distributed; etc.

• Only Outputs that can be delivered by the project are included.
• All Outputs necessary for achieving the Outcomes are included.
• Outputs are precisely defined as results. Examples: quality of school structures improved; community members trained; dental clinic built and operational.
• They are verifiable and measurable.

All Outputs are feasible within the resources available.

Outcomes
As outlined in the definitions, Outcomes are the likely or achieved short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention’s outputs.” What will the project accomplish? The intended physical, financial, institutional, social, environmental, or other development changes resulting from a development project. Effects are: “Intended or unintended change due directly or indirectly to an intervention.” The achievement of Outcomes is beyond the control of management or the implementing entity. The management or implementing agency are responsible for carrying out the Activities with the Inputs provided and producing the Outputs, and should be alert to the possibility that the Outcomes may not be achieved even if the Outputs are produced as planned. However, the target population must use the Outputs to achieve the Outcomes, and these target groups are beyond the control of the management team or implementing entity.
Outcomes describe what the project expects to achieve or how a situation will change as a result of its implementation. Examples: community members have access to water; children have more space in the refurbished classrooms; participants in a Skills Training project are using CAD software to develop architectural drawings and plans. Additional examples are shown in the accompanying box.

**Impacts:**

“Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.”

- A project can contribute to more than one Goal/Impact.
- “Contribute” means that other actions or projects, in addition to the subject project, are required to fully achieve the Goal.
- The Goal statement also does not imply that it will be achieved shortly after the project has been completed. It is a medium- to long-term objective to which the project should contribute.
- The Goal describes the general impact (effects) and benefits derived from the project. It should answer the question: “Why is the project important for the beneficiaries and for the community as a whole?”

---

### Examples of Impact Statement³:

- Attain sustainable growth and development of the Member States by promoting a more balanced and harmonious development of its production and marketing structures;
- Contribute towards the establishment, progress and the realisation of the objectives of the African Economic Community (COMESA MTSP)

---

5. **Management for Development Results**

(MfDR) is multidimensional, relating back to concepts about how to make international development more effective and results-oriented and to practical performance management tools. MfDR builds on several years of work by public sector institutions and development agencies, and reflects an emerging global consensus on the importance of performance measurement in international development.

The principles of MfDR, agreed upon during the Second Roundtable on Managing for Results in 2004, are:

- Focusing the dialogue on results at all phases of the development process
- Aligning programming, monitoring and evaluation with results
- Keeping measurement and reporting simple
- Managing for, not by, results
- Using results information for learning and decision-making

---

³ Adapted from FIAS M&E Handbook
The theories of development change and management change reinforce each other in this process. Development practitioners are applying MfDR at many levels and in many contexts: for example, managers and staff in national public sector ministries, international development institutions, and bilateral donors are all experimenting with various approaches while adding to both conceptual and practical knowledge about MfDR. Development agency and public sector managers are the generators of knowledge in terms of MfDR's implications and its practical application within their areas of work.

MfDR implies that goals are clear, measurable, limited in number, and concrete, with time-bound targets. At the same time, they must be expressed in human terms (i.e., as development outcomes). For this reason, MfDR is more than a methodology: it is a way of thinking and acting, built on a practical toolbox for improved public management. The example below highlights the advantage of MfDR. Feedback and learning take place at the outcome level to make adjustments as needed during the project implementation phase. In each outcome area, undesired effects are addressed by additional measures. Feedback and learning are powerful public management tools that can improve the way results can be achieved.

Results Chain for Managing for Development Results

*Cite* Carol Weiss, a Professor of Education at Harvard University, has spent considerable time questioning the "theory of change" within results matrices for education. Her book, Evaluation, covers this issue in some detail.
### Figure 20: MfDR Example: Quality Improvement Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desired Effects</th>
<th>Undesired effects</th>
<th>Possible Adjustments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impacts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of Export Receipts for Artisanal exporters improves thanks to training</td>
<td>Quality improvements are costly and take additional time</td>
<td>Extend Training to additional staff members Add management training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exporters carry out the quality improvements Indicator: % who complete the training who carry out specified improvements in quality</td>
<td>Some quality improvements, but some do not carry out improvements (%)</td>
<td>Additional support modules introduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exporters complete the series of sessions Indicator: % who complete all 8 sessions</td>
<td>Some registrants drop out (%)</td>
<td>Adjustments to dissemination of course Adjustment to timing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exporters attend sessions Indicator: % of registered who attend the sessions</td>
<td>Some registrants do not attend (%)</td>
<td>Transportation subsidy Day care services provided on site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exporters Register Indicator: % of population of artisanal exporter who register for the training voluntarily</td>
<td>a % does not register</td>
<td>better dissemination change location shorten course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outputs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series of 8 weekly sessions on Quality Improvement for Export Products Dissemination Campaign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6. Additional Resources
- IFC Advisory Services BEE Business Line in association with GTZ and DFID. Monitoring and Evaluation for Business Environment Reform: A Handbook for Practitioners
- MFDR Sourcebook: [http://www.mfdr.org/About/MfDRConcepts-tools_and_principles.pdf](http://www.mfdr.org/About/MfDRConcepts-tools_and_principles.pdf)
Chapter 5 - Performance Indicators

1. Column 2 of the Logframe: Performance Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
<th>Assumptions and risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The OECD/DAC Glossary defines an Indicator as follows:

“Quantitative or qualitative factor or variable that provides a simple and reliable means to measure achievement, to reflect the changes connected to an intervention, or to help assess the performance of a development actor.”

Phrased in a different way, Indicators present the information necessary to determine progress and achievement of the project’s Results. An Indicator will include a variable, a baseline in the case of Outcomes, and a measurable target.

Indicators at the Impact level describe how the overall impact of the project shall be measured. At the Goal/Impact level, the indicators should be the relevant high level results to which the project should contribute. This may be country programmes or MDGs or other high level results.

Indicators at the Outcome(s) level must not be a summary of the Outputs, but measure the effects of the Outputs being used by the project’s beneficiaries. At the Outcome(s) level, they should be initial, intermediate and final outcome indicators that should be observed during project implementation and/or in the short-term after completion. These initial/intermediate/final outcomes should be clearly on the causal chain toward the impact indicators. Outcomes are direct effects that are attributable to the project.

The LFM should include the minimum number of indicators necessary to conclude that the Outcome(s) have been achieved. They should measure the change that can be attributed directly to the project, and the corresponding information should be available at reasonable cost, preferably from existing data sources. The best indicators contribute to ensuring good management and allow the Bank and the executing agency to decide if additional Outputs or corrections will be needed to achieve the Purpose.

Indicators for Outputs measure the deliverables financed by the project. They should be succinct, but clear, descriptions of each of the Outputs that should be completed during implementation.

Performance indicators are the ‘measuring sticks’ that are used to assess progress toward project results. They measure performance by noting changes over time.

Helpful Definitions:

**Performance:** The degree to which a development intervention or a development partner operates according to specific criteria/standards/guidelines or achieves results in accordance with stated goals or plans.

**Performance measurement:** A system for assessing performance of development interventions against stated goals.

**Performance Indicator:** A variable that allows the verification of changes in the development intervention or shows results relative to what was planned. Related terms: performance monitoring, performance measurement.

---

Sometimes referred to as “Objectively Verifiable Indicators” In line with Module 4 of the PowerPoint Presentation
There are two types of indicators:

- **Qualitative indicators** that show changes in attitudes, behaviours, skills, perceptions, quality, level of understanding, etc. Qualitative indicators refer to people’s judgments, opinions, perceptions, attitudes, expressed in numerical form. Numbers, percentages, ranges (e.g., highly satisfactory to very unsatisfactory) and scales are generally used to quantify and rate qualitative indicators. Example: More than 80% of residents in target areas are satisfied with new water service as a result of the programme or intervention.

- **Quantitative indicators** that show changes in numbers, frequency, ratios, percentages, etc. Quantitative indicators are reported in terms of a specific number (number, average, mean, median) or a percentage. It may be important for quantitative indicators to include both numbers and percentages, since a percentage by itself may not indicate the size of a target.

**In Column 2 of the Logframe, enter the performance indicators for each level of results (output, outcome, impact).**

Involves stakeholders in identifying several indicators for each of the results – perhaps in a group brainstorming session

Try to mix qualitative and quantitative indicators to the extent possible.

Note that process indicators (which measure the delivery of activities) and input indicators (which measure the use of financial, human and technological inputs) are not included in the Logframe, but you may want to develop these for your own management purposes. They could be included in activity descriptions or in the management strategy sections.

**1.1. Indicators should have the following attributes:**

Targeted, meaning that they must be specified in terms of Quantity (how much?), Quality (what type?), Time (Outputs – by when; Outcomes – between when and when), Target Group, and Location (when pertinent).

**Objectively verifiable**, meaning that the corresponding information (data) must be readily available on a timely basis to determine actual progress toward a given target. This relates to the LFM’s third column, Means of Verification.

How many indicators? Use only the number required to clarify and measure the achievement of planned results (outputs, purpose, goal) stated in the first column.

If an industry-standard or sector indicator (i.e. health, education, etc.) is available and practical, use it.

Make sure each indicator is measurable, at least, in terms of quantity, quality and time.

Keep in mind that to collect information on an indicator may require new activities, which has an added cost.

In the case of Outcomes, important to establish a baseline in order to set targets and measure changes.

**Practical**, in terms of having the minimum number of indicators necessary to measure a particular objective; indicators for Outputs and intermediate Outcomes should be useful for monitoring and project management. Also, indicators should not refer to something not occurring (e.g., flooding in an area). The cost of obtaining the data on indicators should be as low as possible (cost-efficient).
Baselines are required for indicators of Outcomes. A baseline refers to a situation prior to an intervention against which progress may be measured or comparisons made – it is required in order to measure change. For example, if a project that includes training aims to improve trainees’ skills, we need to have a point of comparison before the training is underway in order to target the improvement and measure project performance.

1.2. Example: Increased Sales for vendors in a market, with improved sanitation

Identify indicator: increased sales of locally grown vegetables with improved sanitation

Specify target group: male and female vendors

Quantify: 350 vendors increase sales by average of 20%

Set quality: sanitary market (dispose of garbage in disposal area)

Specify time frame: between June 2009 and June 2010

Set location: Bandu district market

COMBINE: 350 male and female vendors increase sales of locally-grown vegetables in the Bandu district market by an average of 15% (US$20/day to US$23/day) between June 2009 and June 2010, while improving sanitary conditions (garbage collected and taken to disposal area).

Note also that “There is no such thing as an indicator for a project if there is no existing or planned system for collecting the corresponding data on a timely basis.”
Figure 21: Selection Criteria for Good Indicators

Selection Criteria for Good Indicators

Validity – Does it measure what it is intended to measure?
☐ Will this indicator really measure the result?
☐ Could the indicator be affected by things other than the result?
☐ Will the data mean what it is thought to mean?
☐ Can you support, defend and justify the indicator in logical or scientific terms?

Affordability – Do you have the resources to collect data?
☐ Can you afford to measure this indicator, given the need for timely, accurate information?
☐ Is the potential cost worth the information you will get?
☐ Could these resources be better used to measure other types of change?
☐ Can it be done given the time considerations with respect to this result?

Reliability – Will it be consistent over time?
☐ Does this indicator permit you to measure the result over time?
☐ Will it consistently produce the same data if it is applied repeatedly to the same situation over time?

Usability – Will the information collected be useful for decision-making?
☐ Will the information generated meet the needs of various stakeholders?
☐ Will knowing about this issue help you or other stakeholders to do things better or more effectively? Can you do what you need to do with the information?
☐ Will the information be presentable in a format that will resonate with the intended audience?
☐ Will the information generated illustrate efforts made and progress achieved?
☐ Does it make it easy to communicate the status of the result?
☐ If necessary, does this indicator allow you to compare this result to other results?

Simplicity – How easy will it be to collect the data?
☐ What are the data collection procedures related to this indicator?
☐ Are the sources of information easily accessible?
☐ Is the equipment and/or expertise needed to track the indicator readily available?
☐ Does this indicator allow a relatively easy analysis of the result?
☐ Is it clear and direct enough to be understood by all stakeholders?

Neutrality – Will the indicator measure positive and negative changes?
☐ Will the indicator measure both improvements and declines of the situation?
2. Examples of Indicators for National Strategy for small-scale export promotion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• overall annual GDP growth,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• GDP growth at sectoral level,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• exports as % of GDP,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• % increase in FDI, unemployment,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Number of formal jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• access to credit for small holder farmers,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• investor perceptions,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ease of doing business,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• growth and export competitiveness index</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• index of regulatory quality,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• titled land as % of all land, time and cost for registering a property,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• cost of employment regulations,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• time and cost for export licensing,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• perceptions of duty system,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• average annual cost to import business of compliance with export procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Average number of days to comply with business regulation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Laws/regulations/codes drafted or amended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Number of participants in workshops, training events, seminars, conferences, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Number of participants reporting satisfied or very satisfied with workshops, training, seminars, conferences, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Number of procedures/policies/practices proposed for improvement or elimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Number of reports (assessments, surveys, manuals) completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 6 - Means of Verification

1. Column 3 of the Logframe: Means of Verification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
<th>Assumptions and risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Means of Verification is extremely important, so much so that some agencies have referred to it as the project’s “learning system.” As is common in many countries, one critical problem with development projects is the lack of data. However, it is also quite common to not exploit the data that exists. Remember one general principle discussed in connection with indicators: There is no such thing as an indicator unless there is a planned or existing system for collecting the corresponding information on a timely basis.

The MoV column is equivalent to footnotes and references in a formal document. We need to specify exactly where the information on each and every indicator can be obtained. The third column of the LFM contains information on where the implementing entity and the person(s) doing the monitoring can obtain information on the performance of indicators. This encourages us to identify existing sources of information, or to make provisions to collect it (e.g., by means of a survey), when preparing a profile for a new project.

- At the Outputs level: Are the products and services being delivered as planned? Samples of the products delivered, field inspection/supervision reports, official certificates and user permits, trainee rosters, etc.
- At the Outcomes level: Are the targets being achieved? Results of surveys, field inspection/supervision (trained observer) reports, etc.

The information gleaned from the sources identified in the MOV column will be used as feedback to project management

- To make adjustments to the project
- To improve future projects (preparation)

Secondary sources refer to data that have been collected by various organizations (other than the implementing agency), such as socio-economic survey data collected by another organization, government statistics, demographic and health survey data, etc. While secondary data can be cost-efficient if it can be readily modified for use in a project, it must be used with caution, since it has been collected with other interests in mind. Secondary sources can have problems of timeliness, quality, and level of disaggregation (e.g., by area, gender, age or income group, etc.).

Primary sources refer to data that is collected by the implementing entity itself, and may include surveys, focus group interviews, direct observation (ratings) by trained observers, “rapid appraisal techniques” (used mainly in rural and community development projects) as well as administrative, budget or personnel data.

Primary data normally involves a cost, along with consideration as to which organization will collect the data -- a central statistical office, or another organization or community group. This brings us back to consider the cost-benefit of information – what reasonable amount of information is required?
2. Examples of Means of Verification for International Trade:

- WTO, World Trade Statistics
- OECD
- Regional Trade Statistics
- National Trade Statistics/Annuals
- Customs data
- Regional Trade Associations
- Chambers of Commerce
- National Trade Associations
- National Associations of Exporters
Chapter 7 - Risk and Assumptions

There are basically two types of challenges and constraints to a project: external factors such as changes in the political, economic, or social environment, and internal factors related to project management and strategies (operational challenges and constraints).

Challenges and constraints can affect implementation at different levels:

- Output level challenges and constraints are those that could prevent activities from leading to outputs.
- Outcome level challenges and constraints that could prevent achievement of outcomes are often related to the beneficiaries/target organizations.
- Impact level challenges and constraints are those that could prevent the achievement of impacts.

Challenges and constraints should be identified before the indicators are designed, because they can have a significant effect on the feasibility of results. In many cases, some were identified during the LFA – either during the problem tree or stakeholder analysis. For example, during the stakeholder analysis, some high risk factor such as the involvement of a vocal and powerful lobby group could make it impossible to implement the project or one of its components. If the risks are too high, you may have to revisit the results chain to reassess feasibility. In order to achieve the impact, there must be a new result added to address the risk that this lobby group has undue influence on the project.

In Column 4 of the Logframe, enter the challenges and constraints at each result level (output, outcome, impact).

You do not need to identify challenges and constraints for each result, just for each result level. In other words, identify those challenges and constraints that may affect the achievement of outputs. Then identify challenges and constraints that may affect the transition from outputs to short-term outcomes. Then work your way up the results chain, until you have identified challenges and constraints that affect the achievement of the project’s impact.

In the Activities row of the Assumptions column (Project Execution Assumptions), which are really Operational Assumptions, the World Bank groups assumptions under various criteria: those grouped under Justification and Relevance relate to the extent to which national and local authorities are committed to the project’s objectives, and these are consistent with public policies and regulatory frameworks. Fiduciary Performance relates to ensuring that funds administered by the Bank are used for their intended purposes. Safeguard Quality and Performance refers to the extent the Bank’s policies regarding people and the environment are integrated into project design, appraisal and implementation. Reputation is directly related to image and branding risk, as well as to stakeholder relations. Project Integrity encompasses internal fraud and corruption and borrower/executing agency/suppliers fraud and corruption.
In the Outputs row (Project Effectiveness Assumptions), those grouped under Development relate to the extent the project's outcomes are linked to a priority goal of the Bank’s sector strategy, whether the outcomes are measurable and whether they (at least initial outcomes) are being achieved. Assumptions relating to Reputation appear once again, except that in this case they relate to support by beneficiaries and other important stakeholders for the project's outcomes.

At the Purpose/Development Objectives row (Country-level Impact Assumptions), which are applicable normally in the period following execution, we include those relating to the project’s “continuing rationale,” i.e., the extent to which the project's objectives continue to reflect the country's evolving development priorities and political commitment, and the Bank’s country strategy.

At the Goal row we have assumptions relating to sustainability of the project's benefits, largely related to long-term financing of operational and maintenance costs, and the institutionalization of the systems and processes resulting from the project.

**Figure 22: Assumptions and Risks**

- If we carry out the listed Activities (necessary), and the Assumptions included in Cell 16 hold (sufficient), then we will produce the Outputs.
- If we produce the Outputs as planned (necessary) and the Assumptions included in Cell 15 hold (sufficient), then we will achieve the project’s Purpose.
- If we achieve the project’s Purpose (necessary) and the Assumptions in Cell 14 hold (sufficient), then we will make a significant contribution to attainment of the Goal(s).

There will be uncertainty in any human undertaking – this uncertainty, which we call assumptions or risks, are factors beyond our control, frequently make the difference between success and failure. Assumptions/risks can be derived from the stakeholder analysis, the problem or objectives tree or any other source of information. If we identify assumptions/risks, it is more likely that the Consultant, implementing entity, or Project Manager will communicate with higher authorities, as opposed to avoiding or not reporting the issue. Assumptions can/will change during implementation.

We may use a risk/assumption matrix, as shown below, to assess risk. Depending on the risks and assumptions, we can choose to ignore/avoid, transfer, or mitigate them. If the risk is too high, it may be considered a “killer assumption” and the project should not be carried out.
How to carry out a risk analysis using a risk assumption matrix

- Brainstorm the various risks of the intervention (you may use the last two columns of the stakeholder analysis). At each level of objectives in the logframe, ask the question: Why can stop us from...
  - Doing the activities
  - Delivering these outputs
  - Achieving this outcome
  - Contributing to this goal

- Ask participants to write the answers on separate cards, taking care to word them as risks
- Discuss each risk in turn, assessing how sensitive it is to the impact by writing “very high”, “high”, Low, or “very low”
- Discuss each risk in turn, assessing how likely it is to occur by writing “very high”, “high”, Low, or “very low”
- Identify risks with high impact and high likelihood, which may present a significant threat to the intervention and imply a substantial re-design or even the decision to cancel the intervention (see matrix below top right)
- Ask participants to identify possible mitigation measures for each risk. These are additional activities or outputs that may be included in the intervention to control the risks.
- Write the mitigation measures into activities or outputs and transfer them to the first column of the logframe
- Include all assumptions and risks into Column 4 of the logframe.

Figure 23: Sample Risk-Assumption Matrix
1. Example of a Full Logframe

The following simplified logframe draws from the sample results chain for the Agricultural Products Trade Project (APTP) in the previous section. It presents the indicators and assumptions/challenges and constraints for the impact, outcome, and a selection of outputs. (Note that, for the sake of simplicity, only outputs 1.2, 1.3 and 1.5 are shown on this example logframe. In reality, all outputs must be listed.)

- Use the objectives identified within the analysis of objectives and analysis of alternatives to identify which relate to the goal, outcome, outputs and activities
- Define the structure of the intervention by establishing a hierarchical relationship amongst the objectives
- Complete Column 1 starting from the goal and going down to the outcome, outputs and activities
- Use risk analysis to identify risks that could adversely affect the achievement of desired objectives
- Complete the boxes in the assumptions and risks column
- Check the design logic from the bottom to the top
- Brainstorm indicators that will measure each objective. These are appropriate measures to monitor progress and evaluate the results of the intervention. This could involve going back to the problem tree
- Ensure that all indicators are SMART
- Identify a limited number of indicators which measure each objective. If there is a long list of possible indicators for one particular objective, try to reduce the list so that only the essential ones are included.
- Identify the sources of verification available.

The logframe should be continually updated as new information about the intervention becomes available. For instance, some of the indicators might need to be changed during the project if they are inadequate or too difficult or expensive to measure.
**Figure 24: Example of a Full Logframe**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
<th>Assumptions and Risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact:</strong> Goal: To establish the institutional means to coordinate the development of cross-boundary trade in agricultural products among the member countries.</td>
<td>Impact Indicators: Volume of agricultural trade among COMESA countries as a result of COMESA</td>
<td>Means of verification</td>
<td>Assumptions and Challenges and constraints: Continued good will exists among COMESA countries Quality of the environment in COMESA does not worsen Large-scale droughts do not occur or can be minimised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved markets for agricultural trade among countries in the COMESA region</td>
<td>National Annual statistical review.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome:</strong> To create a regional Agriculture Forum.</td>
<td>Outcome Indicators: Level of effectiveness of the AF in facilitating dialogue, creating and disseminating information, and establishing trade principles</td>
<td>Means of verification</td>
<td>Assumptions and Challenges and constraints: Visibility and credibility of AF remains strong among COMESA country governments AF members observe compliance with systems, governance structures, roles and responsibilities established AF program and service implementation adheres to schedules set AF members develop effective linkages and partnerships with external stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Increased coordination of agricultural markets across countries</td>
<td>Adoption of common agricultural policies in COMESA countries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output:</strong></td>
<td>Output Indicators: Effectiveness/efficiency of financial management system</td>
<td>Means of verification</td>
<td>Assumptions and Challenges and constraints: Qualified experts can be found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Financial management system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 Organizational structure</td>
<td>Effectiveness/efficiency of financial management system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5 Trained agricultural experts</td>
<td>Level of knowledge and awareness of trained experts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 8 - Monitoring and Evaluation

Monitoring and evaluating program performance enables the improved management of the outputs and outcomes while encouraging the allocation of effort and resources in the direction where it will have the greatest impact. M&E can play a crucial role in RBM as it helps to keep projects on track, create the basis for reassessing priorities and create an evidence base for current and future projects through the systematic collection and analysis of information on the implementation of a project. Until recently, M&E has primarily met donor needs for proving or legitimizing the purpose of the program by demonstrating the effective use of resources. The legitimizing function demonstrates whether reforms are having the desired effect in order to be accountable to clients, beneficiaries, development partners and taxpayers for the use of resources.

From an impact perspective, it is often necessary to ‘prove impact’ in order to make resource allocation decisions and to ensure the most effective use of limited resources towards the goal of increasing prosperity in the developing world. Consequently, there is a need for rigor in the means of assessing results that can help reveal causality i.e., have programs resulted in sustainable gains in welfare? Have they reinforced the development of efficient and transparent markets? Have they increased economic growth and reduced poverty? Answering these questions is extremely challenging, especially for policy based interventions which are open to the influence of a wide range of factors. However efforts are being made to adopt more rigorous practices including the use of systematic, quantitative approaches and analysis. There is a growing awareness of the need for practitioners to conduct their own evaluation activities in order to increase understanding of development results, which in turn lead to increased learning and improving within their organization. This learning function enhances organizational and development learning to increase the understanding of why particular interventions have been more or less successful. Additionally, this understanding informs decision making and potentially improves performance.

1. What is Monitoring

Systematic Monitoring has to do with

- Determining the progress of project execution/implementation
- Giving feedback on the project to stakeholders
- Recommending corrective action to address problems that affect the project, improving performance and enhancing the probability that it will achieve its Planned Outcome(s).

Monitoring also has to do with analyzing project performance in terms of Efficiency and Effectiveness.

**Efficiency**: the extent to which project inputs were supplied and managed and the activities organized in the most appropriate manner at the least cost to produce the necessary outputs.

**Effectiveness**: the extent to which the project produced its expected outputs and is therefore achieving its Planned Outcome(s).

Under a results-based approach, “good monitoring” implies continuous and systematic monitoring, the participation of key stakeholders and a focus on progress toward achieving results.

Monitoring allows the implementing agency to identify strengths and shortcomings on a timely basis in order to implement recommended corrective action. Monitoring takes place during implementation but does not occur during other phases of the project cycle.
2. What is Evaluation

Evaluation occurs throughout the project cycle, including in the period after the project is completed in the case of impact and/or sustainability evaluations. To be effective, evaluation has to be systematic in the same manner as Monitoring.

- Evaluation asks whether the project is “working” and whether it is working in light of the results that have been achieved. Note that in this definition the emphasis is on processes and results.
- Evaluation requires assigning time for a special task and normally involves the participation of specialized professionals not normally assigned to the project. Examples are Formative Evaluations, Mid-Term Evaluations, and Ex-Post or Summative Evaluations.
- Evaluation covers effectiveness and efficiency, but also impact and sustainability.

3. What is the difference between Monitoring and Evaluation?

Monitoring is a Continuous Process. Monitoring happens, or should happen, every day, every week and every month of a project’s life. It is the continuous process of observing, analyzing and suggesting adjustments that helps keep a project on track to achieve its Planned Outcome(s).

Evaluation is Periodic. It consists of making judgments concerning what is observed on a larger scale, such as issues of design and impacts – both intended and unintended impacts.

The distinction between monitoring and evaluation from other oversight activities

Like monitoring and evaluation, inspection, audit, review and research functions are oversight activities, but they each have a distinct focus and role and should not be confused with monitoring and evaluation.

**Inspection** is a general examination of an organizational unit, issue or practice to ascertain the extent it adheres to normative standards, good practices or other criteria and to make recommendations for improvement or corrective action. It is often performed when there is a perceived risk of non-compliance.

**Audit** is an assessment of the adequacy of management controls to ensure the economical and efficient use of resources; the safeguarding of assets; the reliability of financial and other information; the compliance with regulations, rules and established policies; the effectiveness of risk management; and the adequacy of organizational structures, systems and processes. Evaluation is more closely linked to MfDR and learning, while audit focuses on compliance.

**Reviews**, such as rapid assessments and peer reviews, are distinct from evaluation and more closely associated with monitoring. They are periodic or ad hoc, often light assessments, of the performance of an initiative and do not apply the due process of evaluation or rigor in methodology. Reviews tend to emphasize operational issues. Unlike evaluations conducted by independent evaluators, reviews are often conducted by those internal to the subject or the commissioning organization.

**Research** is a systematic examination completed to develop or contribute to knowledge of a particular topic. Research can often feed information into evaluations and other assessments but does not normally inform decision-making on its own.

4. Using M&E with the Logframe

The tools presented in the previous chapters help in monitoring and evaluation. Planning for results, measuring using indicators and means of verification and a regular revisiting of the risks and assumptions of an intervention are critical in RBM.

Moreover, appropriate institutional arrangements for managing M&E are a prerequisite for ensuring effective processes and for making full use of the information generated by M&E systems. Plans for proper monitoring and periodic evaluation should be built into the design of the program at inception. Institutional arrangements need to meet the requirements for (a) a policy and set of guidelines for M&E, including a disclosure policy; (b) impartiality and independence of evaluations; and (c) using M&E findings to improve future decision making and activities.

While there are challenges for designing and undertaking M&E there are also proven strategies and tactics that can mitigate these challenges and point ways of overcoming anticipated challenges. Certainly for some programs the scope and scale are complex, as are the sets of stakeholders and processes involved. Therefore as a general rule: Firstly, it is important to define realistic expectations for assessments of interventions and recognize that learning will come from innovation and practice rather than thinking and theorizing alone. Secondly, that not ‘one size fits all’ and selection of the most appropriate approach, methodology, techniques and tools is required. Thirdly, recognize that discussions about progress towards goals and debates about what are appropriate indicators can be an instructive part of the planning process. To that end, an important principle is to ensure that an M&E is considered alongside program design and assessment and that an M&E system and plan is put in place which clearly articulates how evaluation will occur throughout the project management cycle. A number of concepts exist to address M&E systems:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>There are several reasons why M&amp;E is not always carried out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do not want to highlight deficiencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implies making decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considered an expense and not an investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture of Reward/Punishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s not common practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not recognize usefulness of M&amp;E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Steps for Monitoring:

1. Clarify tasks and responsibilities of those involved in monitoring
2. Compare the planned time with the actual time required to carry out individual activities
3. Monitor the use of resources in a spreadsheet based on the resource and cost schedule
4. Use Monitoring tools (see below) to monitor progress towards the accomplishment of activities and resources, outputs, outcomes and impacts over a period of time
5. Compare planned and actual achievements
6. Use indicators in the logframe to assess the effects of the intervention at different levels of the intervention logic
7. Monitor the external environment to determine whether assumptions are still accurate and risks are being managed or mitigated
8. If minor deviations from the work plan are identified, adjust the timing of activities and resources according to monitoring information.
**Performance Measurement Framework (PMF)** is a tool to organize results monitoring and evaluation processes. The PMF links what you will monitor with how you will do it. It is designed at the start of a project, may be updated annually, as required and is used for baseline collection and later for comparison with actual progress.

Completing the PMF involves the following steps:

- Start by entering the results statements and performance indicators from the logframe
- For each indicator, select data sources, data collection methodology, and frequency for data collection.
- Define roles and responsibilities for data collection, and what the data will be used for
- If baseline data are available, record this in the PMF. If baseline is not available, keep it in mind as one of the next steps to take in completing the PMF
- Once the baseline is established, you may wish to establish targets for the changes in status of each indicator

The elements of the PMF are presented in a 9-column matrix like the one shown below.

**Figure 25: Sample PMF Matrix**

The following simplified PMF draws from the sample logframe for the Agricultural Products Trade Project (APTP) in the previous section. It presents the indicators for the impact, outcome, and a selection of outputs, in addition to details on how these indicators will be measured. (Note that, for the sake of simplicity, only outputs 1.2, 1.3 and 1.5 appear on this PMF. In reality, all outputs must be listed.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Collecton Method</th>
<th>Frequenty</th>
<th>Responsib le</th>
<th>Data Use</th>
<th>Baseline (2006)</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact</strong></td>
<td>Improved markets for agricultural trade among countries in the COMESA</td>
<td>Volume of agricultural trade among COMESA countries as a result of COMESA</td>
<td>National agriculture and trade ministries, agricultural producers</td>
<td>Document review, interview s, surveys</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Project Manager, Agriculture Forum</td>
<td>Evaluation, planning</td>
<td>US $xx billion</td>
<td>US $xx billion (50% increase) by 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome</strong></td>
<td>1. Increased coordination of agricultural markets across countries</td>
<td>Level of effectiveness of the AF in creating and disseminating information, facilitating dialogue, and establishing trade principles</td>
<td>Evaluation s and other reviews of Agriculture Forum</td>
<td>Document review</td>
<td>In 2008, 2010 and 2011</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Evaluation finds AF to be highly effective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Results Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Collect on Method</th>
<th>Frequen c y</th>
<th>Responsib le</th>
<th>Data Use</th>
<th>Baseline (2006)</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National agriculture ministries</td>
<td>Document review, interview s</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Project Manager, Agriculture Forum</td>
<td>Evaluation, planning</td>
<td>Zero</td>
<td>All nine countries by 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of financial management system</td>
<td>Document review, interview s</td>
<td>In 2008</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Less than 3 instances of non-compliance noted in audit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature of MoU by participating countries</td>
<td>Committ ee meetings</td>
<td>Once</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Evaluation, planning, accountabili ty</td>
<td>MoU not created</td>
<td>MoU developed and signed by 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of reporting processes</td>
<td>Interview s Document review</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Evaluation, planning, accountabili ty</td>
<td>Reporting processes not implement ed</td>
<td>Full functionin g and complianc e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys and telephone interviews of workshop participant s</td>
<td>Paper survey after training, and surveys/interview s 6 months after</td>
<td>After each workshop</td>
<td>Workshop facilitators</td>
<td>Evaluation, planning, accountabili ty</td>
<td>Competency assessment to be completed prior to each workshop</td>
<td>To be set after competency assessment conducted for each workshop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Work Breakdown Structure

The Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) is a results-oriented tool that captures all the work of an intervention in an organized way. It breaks work into activities and tasks that collectively lead to outputs.

The WBS creates a 'bridge' among inputs, completed activities, and results. (Activities and inputs are not results, but elements that influence achievement of results.) The WBS contributes to continuous updating of workplans and results-based reports. A Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) is often portrayed graphically as a hierarchical tree, as shown here. However, it can also be shown as a tabular list of activities and tasks in a Gantt chart.
The WBS is developed at the beginning of a project to define the project scope, organize schedules, and estimate costs.

- Break work into a small number of coherent ‘packages’
- Ensure that they will address each output at sufficient depth that the output will be realized

Throughout the project the WBS is used to identify and track work packages for each period.

**Guidance**

1. Map the work breakdown structure (WBS) into the matrix.
2. Analyze each WBS element to determine which individuals will be responsible for which activities (or summary activities). (Insert columns as needed to identify all required resources.)
3. After all WBS elements are analyzed, review the matrix for unidentified resources and roles.
4. Obtain resource commitments from appropriate organizations for the identified resources and roles; modify the matrix as appropriate to reflect those negotiations.
5. Repeat Steps 1 through 4 for each level of detail added to the WBS down to the work package level.
6. Review and update the matrix with the project team members and organization authorities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Subtask</th>
<th>PM</th>
<th>[Skill/Name</th>
<th>[Skill/Name]</th>
<th>[Skill/Name]</th>
<th>[Skill/Name]</th>
<th>[Skill/Name]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Summary Activity]</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Task</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Task</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Task</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Summary Activity]</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Task</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Task</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Task</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Task</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Summary Activity]</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Task</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Task</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Task 2

### Task 2.1

### [Summary Activity]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtask</th>
<th>PM</th>
<th>Skill/Name</th>
<th>Skill/Name</th>
<th>Skill/Name</th>
<th>Skill/Name</th>
<th>Skill/Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY:** PM = Project Manager; [insert acronyms/definitions as appropriate] RACI = R = Responsible, A = Accountable/Approve, C = Consult, I = Inform
Figure 28: Example of a Results Table for the Agricultural Products Trade Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Results (with intended beneficiaries)</th>
<th>Performance Indicators and Targets</th>
<th>Reported Progress to Date</th>
<th>Targets for the Planning Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1: Increased coordination of agricultural markets across countries</td>
<td>Level of effectiveness of the AF in creating and disseminating information, facilitating dialogue, and establishing trade principles. <strong>Final Target:</strong> Evaluation finds AF to be highly effective</td>
<td>No progress to date</td>
<td>No targets for the planning period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adoption of common agricultural policies in COMESA countries. <strong>Final Target:</strong> All nine countries by 2012</td>
<td>Preliminary research completed and commencement of policy drafting</td>
<td>Preliminary policy drafts completed and submitted for discussion and feedback from all nine countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 1.2: Financial management system</td>
<td>Minimal instances of non-compliance. <strong>Final Target:</strong> Less than 3 instances of non-compliance noted in audit</td>
<td>N/A – Audit has not been completed</td>
<td>N/A – Audit to commence in the following planning period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 1.3: Organizational structure</td>
<td>Signature of MoU by participating countries. <strong>Final Target:</strong> MoU developed and signed by 2008</td>
<td>MoU development underway</td>
<td>MoU developed and signed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation of reporting processes. <strong>Final Target:</strong> Full functioning and compliance</td>
<td>No progress to date</td>
<td>Reporting processes implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 1.5: Trained agricultural experts</td>
<td>Level of knowledge and awareness of trained experts. <strong>Final Target:</strong> To be set after competency assessment conducted for each workshop</td>
<td>68% of trained experts felt high level of knowledge and awareness: in workshops completed to date</td>
<td>80% of trained experts felt high level of knowledge and awareness Set final target</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 29: Planned Activities Chart: An Example from the Agricultural Products Trade Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Qtr 1</th>
<th>Qtr 2</th>
<th>Qtr 3</th>
<th>Qtr 4</th>
<th>Resources (financial) (US$)</th>
<th>Responsibility (title of person responsible)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1. Increased coordination of agricultural markets across countries by the Agricultural Forum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 1.2 Financial management system</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1.2.1 Develop and implement a financial management system</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>Project manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1.2.2 Provide training on using the system</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>Project manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 1.3 Organizational structure</td>
<td>$376,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1.3.1 Establish the governance structure for the AF</td>
<td>$146,000</td>
<td>Project manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1.3.2 Develop MoU and legal framework for AF</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
<td>Project manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1.3.3 Develop roles, responsibilities and reporting for AF</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>Project manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 1.5 Trained agricultural experts</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1.5.1 Conduct training program for experts from agricultural ministries</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>Workshop facilitators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1.5.2 Recruit experts to AF</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>Workshop facilitators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1 Planning</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>Project manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 2 Monitoring</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>Project manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 3 Reporting</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>Project manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Figure 30: Results for the Period – An Example from the Agricultural Products Trade Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outputs &amp; Activities⁶</th>
<th>Performance Indicators⁷</th>
<th>Planned Achievements</th>
<th>Actual Achievements</th>
<th>Variance and Steering Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 1: Increased coordination of agricultural markets across countries</strong></td>
<td>Level of effectiveness of the AF in creating and disseminating information, facilitating dialogue, and establishing trade principles. <strong>Final Target:</strong> Evaluation finds AF to be highly effective</td>
<td>No targets for the planning period</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adoption of common agricultural policies in COMESA countries. <strong>Final Target:</strong> All nine countries by 2012</td>
<td>Preliminary policy drafts completed and submitted for discussion and feedback from all nine countries</td>
<td>Preliminary policy drafts completed and submitted for discussion and feedback from all nine countries</td>
<td>Unintended result of supporting and including young women lawyers in policy making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 1.2: Financial management system</strong></td>
<td>Minimal instances of non-compliance. <strong>Final Target:</strong> Less than 3 instances of non-compliance noted in audit</td>
<td>N/A – Audit to commence in the following planning period</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 1.3: Organizational structure</strong></td>
<td>Signature of MoU by participating countries. <strong>Final Target:</strong> MoU developed and signed by 2008</td>
<td>MoU developed and signed</td>
<td>MoU developed and signed</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation of reporting processes. <strong>Final Target:</strong> Full functioning and compliance</td>
<td>Reporting processes implemented</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Low personnel with minimal resources and other priorities. Will be a priority in the next period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 1.5: Trained agricultural experts</strong></td>
<td>Level of knowledge and awareness of trained experts. <strong>Final Target:</strong> To be set after competency assessment conducted for each workshop</td>
<td>80% of trained experts felt high level of knowledge and awareness Set final target</td>
<td>72% of trained experts felt high level of knowledge and awareness Final target not set</td>
<td>Weaknesses in the training workshops still to be dealt with. Analysis and collaboration for setting final target not completed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

⁶ For this year only, you may choose to report instead according to your 2005 workplan, which may have focused on components and activities.

⁷ As above.
Figure 31: Cumulative Results – An Example from the Agricultural Products Trade Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Overall Planned Achievements</th>
<th>Actual Achievements to-date</th>
<th>Assessment of Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1: Increased coordination of agricultural markets across countries</td>
<td>Level of effectiveness of the AF in creating and disseminating information, facilitating dialogue, and establishing trade principles.</td>
<td>Evaluation finds AF to be highly effective</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>As this is a long-term outcome, there is no expectation for results to date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adoption of common agricultural policies in COMESA countries.</td>
<td>All nine countries by 2012</td>
<td>Preliminary policy drafts completed and submitted for discussion and feedback from all nine countries</td>
<td>This process is well on its way and deadlines are expected to be met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 1.2: Financial management system</td>
<td>Minimal instances of non-compliance.</td>
<td>Less than 3 instances of non-compliance noted in audit</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Audit will be completed in next reporting period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 1.3: Organizational structure</td>
<td>Signature of MoU by participating countries.</td>
<td>MoU developed and signed by 2008</td>
<td>MoU developed and signed</td>
<td>Excellent performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation of reporting processes.</td>
<td>Full functioning and compliance</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Greater performance required in next period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 1.5: Trained agricultural experts</td>
<td>Level of knowledge and awareness of trained experts.</td>
<td>To be set after competency assessment conducted for each workshop</td>
<td>72% of trained experts felt high level of knowledge and awareness</td>
<td>Work is underway but slower than expected.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Evaluation

What information is needed? Examples:

- Information on the relevance of intended outputs or outcomes and validity of the results framework and results map
- Information about the status of an outcome and factors affecting it
- Information about the effectiveness of the partnership strategy
- Information about the status of project implementation
- Information on the cost of an initiative relative to the observed benefits
- Information about lessons learned

---

8 For 2006 only, you may choose to omit this column if the information is not available.
Who will use the information

- REC management and programme or project officers and managers, others involved in design and implementation
- National government counterparts, policy makers, strategic planners
- Development partners
- Trade Associations
- Public and beneficiaries

6. Using M&E with the Logframe

- Toolkits, a practical guide to planning, monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment. (Save the Children, 2003)
Appendix I  OECD Glossary of Monitoring and Evaluation Terms

GLOSSARY OF KEY TERMS IN EVALUATION AND RESULTS BASED MANAGEMENT

GLOSSAIRE DES PRINCIPAUX TERMES RELATIFS À L’ÉVALUATION ET LA GESTION AXÉE SUR LES RÉSULTATS

معجم المصطلحات الأساسية في التقييم والإدارة القائمة على النتائج
# Appendix II Data Collection Guide

The following description of data collection methods was excerpted from Toolkits: A Practical Guide to Planning, Monitoring, Evaluation and Impact Assessment, Louisa Gosling and Mike Edwards, Save the Children, 2003.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Definition of Method</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document Review</td>
<td>Analysis of the content of relevant documents, policies, etc., to find common trends, opinions, perceptions, etc.</td>
<td>An analysis grid should be developed to guide the identification of emerging core issues. The grid should be linked to the questions to be answered in the monitoring or evaluation. In case on monitoring – it should be linked to the results and indicators for results that you want to collect information on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-structured Interviews</td>
<td>An INTERVIEW is a data-collection technique that involves oral questioning of respondents, either individually or as a group. Interviews with selected individuals linked to the project through their knowledge and experience. It is a flexible method that nevertheless allows for systematic gathering of data across various stakeholders - individuals. The interviews are qualitative, in-depth, and ask a series of open-ended questions across many stakeholders involved in the project.</td>
<td>In conducting interviews rely on interview guides/protocols that list several major topics to provide a systematic and consistent approach to data collection. The interviewing team may consist of 1-3 people, with one note taker. Each interviewer should have the same list of questions (interview guide). Beginning with traditional greeting, the purpose of the interview must be explained. Conduct the interview informally and mix questions with free discussion. Interview questions may be added or omitted, depending on the interviewees’ knowledge. Individual interviews should last about 45 minutes. Be open minded and objective – do not ask leading questions. Move carefully from general questions to more sensitive questions. Listen and record answers but be aware of non-verbal signs also. Take as complete notes as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Groups</td>
<td>Facilitated discussions among 8–12 carefully selected participants with similar backgrounds.</td>
<td>Group sessions require more preparation than individual interviews. Select individuals with similar rather than different experiences (for instance, women, staff, management should be grouped separately) The facilitator is chosen to keep the discussion focused on the topic. The facilitator will use a discussion guide prepared in advance. Note takers will record comments and observations. Focus groups should be conducted in a space that is large enough to accommodate the group and that is private enough that there will be no interruptions. The atmosphere should be relaxed and informal. The group should have a clear understanding of the purpose of the meeting. All members should feel equal and there should be a high degree of trust. Use flip charts to make notes for consensus building. A note taker will record the discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>Consultants/project staff/program staff may participate in events that pertain to the topic being examined to gather additional perspectives from people directly and indirectly affected by the project</td>
<td>Participating in selected special events that take place while the project is analyzing its performance. Those events may include training session, board meetings, management meetings, presentations, community meeting with the partner organization, etc. Participation should include active participation in the event (vs. observation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Definition of Method</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Reflective      | Sessions with the Program stakeholders utilized to present findings and receive feedback. Comments and perceptions from the participants will then be used to revise/adjust/inform subsequent data collection/analysis of results. | Debriefing sessions with key stakeholders (from the organizational or community stakeholders, individuals interviewed, managers, country staff) are conducted to collect their feedback from the monitoring visits.  
Try to look for consensus in the opinion to identify gaps, limitations of the monitoring, etc. Record the comments and reflect on the points that raise most attention. |
| Surveys with    | Surveys are used to collect information across a population. The emphasis is usually on quantitative data that can be analyzed using statistical methods. Surveys can also ask qualitative, open-ended questions to supplement the quantitative data. The people surveyed usually know the technique and know how to use and complete surveys.  
Surveys provide precise, statistical answers to questions. In a questionnaire everyone is asked the same question to ensure the results may be compared. Method of analysis is fairly straightforward.  
Surveys provide data from various groups of people and allow for comparison between groups. Repeated surveys may be excellent to track indicator changes. | Formulate the questions you want answered. Carefully design the survey to make sure it will be able to answer the questions that you want to get the answers to. Since the same survey may be used throughout the project, make sure it will capture changes over time.  
Ensure that the order of questions and the wording are clear. Translate the questionnaire if necessary. Carry out a pilot survey – test it.  
There are various methods to carrying out a survey. You may need to hire people to carry out the survey in cases where the population is illiterate, or does not have access to computer, etc. In this case the people to carry out surveys must be trained, well prepared, literate, able to contact and communicate with the person that is to collaborate in the process.  
When survey participants have access to computers, you may use either word-processing software or internet service to deliver the survey.  
You may target the entire population or choose a sample of people to be interviewed. Make sure the sample is representative to avoid bias. If you are targeting different groups, design introductory questions to ensure that you know what group does the person belong to.  
You may want to read more about surveys in appropriate literature, as designing and delivering surveys is more complicated than it appears. Every word in a survey is important. Questions must be carefully designed and the scale/rating must be easily understood. |
<p>| set             | questionnaires                                                                                                                                                |                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| Forms and       | Informal and very subjective methodology to capture individual experiences during the program.                                                                                                                        | Ask participants (volunteers or staff mentors) to keep a diary of their observations, comments, and feelings about their participation in the program. A diary may be especially useful in capturing the changes in attitudes of the volunteers. |
| Diaries         |                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Definition of Method</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project visits</td>
<td>A formal method of data collection used for verification of the data received from project stakeholders.</td>
<td>To ensure consistency among programs and projects, a common generic format for the visit activities may be developed across the organization. A common reporting format from the visits may also be developed to allow cross-analysis of various projects. It is important to plan the visit carefully, share the plan with the visited stakeholders. The terms of reference (TORs) for the visit should outline its purpose, timing, background information on the project. The timing of the visit should be carefully chosen to interfere as little as possible with the regular operation of the organization. The people to be interviewed should be informed in advance. There may be a different type of feedback depending on the formality of the visit: oral presentation to managers, brief report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>Observing objects, events, processes, relationships or people’s behaviour in a systematic way and recording observations. It is a good way to crosscheck peoples’ answers to questions.</td>
<td>Draw up a checklist to ensure that all observers use the same criteria. Think about the objectives and broad topics Identify indicators that you can assess through direct observation, and use these to create the checklist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral history</td>
<td>People are asked to talk about history of a place or particular situation or of their lives. The results are used to build a picture of what has happened over time.</td>
<td>Informal conversations with various community members, project staff, organizational staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>An informal information gathering method that uses everyday situations to collect the data</td>
<td>This may be carried out by listening to what people say in different situations and recording the answers by theme, topic, group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranking and scoring</td>
<td>Ranking means placing elements in order, and can reveal differences within a population. Ranking can help to identify problems or individual preferences and the criteria people use when deciding in what order to place things. Ranking allows comparison of the priorities of different groups.</td>
<td>Ranking exercises can be used during interviews or on their own and can lead to other questions. There are different types of ranking: Preference ranking where people vote to select priorities. Pair wise ranking where a matrix is drawn to compare which is the preferred choice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Definition of Method</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructions of map and diagrams</td>
<td>A diagram or a map can help present information in an easily understandable form – a simplified model of reality.</td>
<td>It is useful to draw diagrams or maps in groups. They are useful for finding out about an area, and about how different groups use the area. For example, a map drawn by a group of women may show different features than a map of the same area drawn by men or children. There are different types of maps or diagrams. Social maps: maps of a village or area that shows where different groups/types of people live. Mobility maps: these record, compare and analyze the movements of different groups in a community and are useful to assess a person’s contact with the outside world. Time trends: graphs that show how things change over time. Time trends can be used for many variables: migration, population size, birth and death rates, malnutrition, perceptions. Historical profiles: simple lists giving a summary overview of the key historical events in a community and their significance for the present. Daily routine diagrams: help compare daily routines of different groups of people. Can be useful in assessing changes in household roles. Livelihood analysis: Can help interpretation of the behaviour, decisions and coping strategies of households with different socio-economic status. Venn Diagrams: can be used to show the key organizations and individuals in a community and their relationships. Different circles indicate the organization and individuals. When the circles are separated, there is not link. When the touch, information passes. When they overlap, there is some cooperation. Etc. You may wish to consult additional materials on Participatory Rural Assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Resources**  
The following resources on Results-Based Planning are provided in the Manual Appendices:  
- OECD Glossary of Results-Based and Evaluation Terms (Appendix 1)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OECD/DAC Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results-Based Management 2002</th>
<th>UNDG Approved Harmonized Terminology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development Intervention</strong>&lt;br&gt;An instrument for partner (donor and non-donor) support aimed to promote development.</td>
<td>Development Intervention&lt;br&gt;Ditto plus: A development intervention usually refers to a country programme (CP), programme/thematic component within a CP or a project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong>&lt;br&gt;The output, outcome or impact (intended or unintended, positive and/or negative) of a development intervention.</td>
<td>Results&lt;br&gt;Results are changes in a state or condition which derive from a cause-and-effect relationship. There are three types of such changes (intended or unintended, positive and/or negative) which can be set in motion by a development intervention – its output, outcome and impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal</strong>&lt;br&gt;The higher-order objective to which a development intervention is intended to contribute.</td>
<td>Goal&lt;br&gt;Ditto.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact</strong>&lt;br&gt;Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.</td>
<td>Impact&lt;br&gt;Positive and negative long-term effects on identifiable population groups produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. These effects can be economic, socio-cultural, institutional, environmental, technological or of other types.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome</strong>&lt;br&gt;The likely or achieved short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention’s outputs.</td>
<td>Outcome&lt;br&gt;The intended or achieved short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention’s outputs, usually requiring the collective effort of partners. Outcomes represent changes in development conditions which occur between the completion of outputs and the achievement of impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outputs</strong>&lt;br&gt;The products, capital goods and services which result from a development intervention; may also include changes resulting from the intervention which are relevant to the achievement of outcomes.</td>
<td>Outputs&lt;br&gt;The products and services which result from the completion of activities within a development intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inputs</strong>&lt;br&gt;The financial, human and material resources used for the development intervention.</td>
<td>Inputs&lt;br&gt;The financial, human, material, technological and information resources used for the development intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity</strong>&lt;br&gt;Actions taken or work performed through which inputs, such as funds, technical assistance and other types of resources are mobilised to produce specific outputs.</td>
<td>Activity&lt;br&gt;Ditto.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD/DAC Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results-Based Management 2002</td>
<td>UNDG Approved Harmonized Terminology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Performance**  
The degree to which a development intervention or a development partner operates according to specific criteria/standard/guidelines or achieves results in accordance with stated goals and plans.  
**Performance indicator**  
A variable that allows the verification of changes in the development intervention or shows results relative to what was planned.  
**Benchmark**  
Reference point or standard against which performance or achievements can be assessed.  
*Note:* A benchmark refers to the performance that has been achieved in the recent past by other comparable organizations, or what can be reasonably inferred to have been achieved in the circumstances.  
**Performance measurement**  
A system for assessing performance of development interventions against stated goals.  
**Performance monitoring**  
A continuous process of collecting and analysing data to compare how well a project, programme or policy is being implemented against expected results.  
**Outcome Evaluation**  
None provided. | **Performance**  
The degree to which a development intervention or a development partner operates according to specific criteria/standard/guidelines or achieves results in accordance with stated plans.  
**Performance indicator**  
A quantitative or qualitative variable that allows the verification of changes produced by a development intervention relative to what was planned.  
**Benchmark**  
Reference point or standard against which progress or achievements can be assessed. A benchmark refers to the performance that has been achieved in the recent past by other comparable organizations, or what can be reasonably inferred to have been achieved in similar circumstances.  
**Performance measurement**  
A system for assessing the performance of development interventions, partnerships or policy reforms relative to what was planned, in terms of the achievement of outputs and outcomes. Performance measurement relies upon the collection, analysis, interpretation and reporting of data for performance indicators.  
**Performance monitoring**  
A continuous process of collecting and analysing data for performance indicators, to compare how well a development intervention, partnership or policy reform is being implemented against expected results (achievement of outputs and progress towards outcomes).  
**Outcome Evaluation**  
An in-depth examination of a related set of programmes, projects and strategies intended to achieve a specific outcome, to gauge the extent of success in achieving the outcome; assess the underlying reasons for achievement or non-achievement; validate the contributions of a specific organization to the outcome; and identify key lessons learned and recommendations to improve performance. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>OECD/DAC Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results-Based Management 2002</strong></th>
<th><strong>UNDG Approved Harmonized Terminology</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results Chain</strong>&lt;br&gt;The causal sequence for a development intervention that stipulates the necessary sequence to achieve desired objectives – beginning with inputs, moving through activities and outputs, and culminating in outcomes, impacts and feedback. In some agencies, reach is part of the results chain.</td>
<td><strong>Results Chain</strong>&lt;br&gt;Ditto plus: It is based on a theory of change, including underlying assumptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results Framework</strong>&lt;br&gt;The programme logic that explains how the development objective is to be achieved, including causal relationships and underlying assumptions.</td>
<td><strong>Results Framework</strong>&lt;br&gt;The logic that explains how results are to be achieved, including causal relationships and underlying assumptions. The results framework is the application of the logframe approach at a more strategic level, across an entire organisation, for a country programme, a programme component within a country programme, or even a project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Logical Framework (Logframe)</strong>&lt;br&gt;Management tool used to improve the design of interventions, most often at the project level. It involves identifying strategic elements (inputs, outputs, outcomes and impact) and their causal relationships, indicators, and the assumptions and risks that may influence success and failure. It thus facilitates planning, execution and evaluation of a development intervention.</td>
<td><strong>Logical Framework (Logframe)</strong>&lt;br&gt;Ditto.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results Based Management (RBM)</strong>&lt;br&gt;A management strategy focusing on performance and achievement of outputs, outcomes and impacts.</td>
<td><strong>Results Based Management (RBM)</strong>&lt;br&gt;A management strategy by which an organization ensures that its processes, products and services contribute to the achievement of desired results (outputs, outcomes and impacts). RBM rests on clearly defined accountability for results, and requires monitoring and self-assessment of progress towards results, and reporting on performance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>