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A Objectives of the Pilot Study

Mission am Nil International (MN) decided to use the concept of Programme Cycle management for the implementation of its projects and program. Project and Programme cycle management is based on the logical framework approach and is implemented in cooperation between project management team, development worker(s) and MN.

The most significant points in this cycle are:
Project level:
- The regular project visits of the co-ordinator and the MN country representative
- Monthly and annual reports from the projects and the development workers to the MN country representative
- The annual planning meetings between those three parties

Programme level:
- The annual reports from the projects
- The biannual meetings of the programme committee (with experts in the different sectors)
- The International Steering Committee (ISC) meeting (with representative of the partners/projects)
- The programme evaluation during the second part of a programme phase

The objective of this study was on one hand to test the practicability of the UNV methodology for the assessment of the impact of development workers for the situation of MN as well as to evaluate the impact of MN on the project and sector level in Ethiopia and Egypt. Additionally, the results contributed to the Unité discussion about the impact of development service in general.

Objective 1
Test the practicability of the UNV/E-Changer method for MN and its programme and project management on project and sector levels.
- Incorporate the evaluation into the project and programme cycle management of MN in the programme phase 2013-2016 for the planning of the following phase 2017-2020
- Analyse the value and practicability of this method for the measurement/verification of impact
- Include the project management team and the ISC in the learning process of impact verification

Objective 2
Assess the effect/impact of MN development worker assignments in Ethiopia and Egypt in two specific sectors (health and education (more specific: vocational training)).
B Background Information

Development aid and impact
Development aid in general and NGOs, too, are facing more and more pressure to verify and demonstrate the effects of their actions. The main question is: Are we really making a difference with our projects? Is our project really creating a positive impact? Or are we only having a hopeful feeling?

It is rather difficult to measure impact, as there is always some uncertainty involved as to the link between the activities and the observed effects (attribution gap). But what is not measured or recorded cannot be managed, controlled or improved. To face the challenge to verify the effects of volunteers this study combines a mix of different complementary methods described in further chapters.

As MN combines financial support with development worker assignments, the study will look at the combined effects of assignments and projects.

The focus will be on the partner (project) and sector (health and vocational training) level. Two Ethiopian projects and one Egyptian project will be included, each with development worker, co-ordinator, project team, beneficiaries and network.

Of primary interest are output and outcome levels.

The results shall be discussed with the International Steering Committee to get a viable feedback for the MN sector and institution programme as well as a basis for the work of the programme committee.

The “Participatory Methodology for Assessing the Contribution of Volunteering for Development” developed by ‘United Nations Volunteers’ (UNV)

The UNV methodology consists of three consecutive levels of workshops with representatives of all concerned parties.

1. Three key questions
   - What are the principal results? (categorized as outputs → outcomes → impacts)
   - How do we reach these results? (factors that determine the process)
   - What lessons do we have to learn and what recommendations can we give? (plan of action)

2. Three levels
   - Workshop at the level of project/partner
   - Workshop at the level of sector program
   - Workshop at the level of the Institution Programme

3. Methodological characteristics
   - Bottom-up (Project/assignment ⇒ sector programme ⇒ institutional programme)
   - Qualitative approach and triangulation principle
   - Pragmatic use of different methods: Logical Framework, Outcome Mapping, MSC story-telling
   - Participation of partners and beneficiaries
   - Workshop methodology which allows critical reflections and collective learning
   - Structured outline for the workshops to obtain (+/-) uniform and comparable results
   - Structured sequence of workshops which makes the results comparable
**C Protocol**

*Preliminary Remark:*

*Mission am Nil has only conducted the workshop on level 1. Therefore, this part of the protocol has been tested and updated also with the experiences during the workshop by the author.*

*The protocols for level 2 and 3 were translated from the French E-Changer protocol and supplemented with parts of the UNV protocol. Some changes were made to allow for the specific situation of MN. But as these parts have not yet been tested, they will probably need some further refinement before they can be used by any other organisation.*

1. **Level 1: Partner/project**

1.1. **General Information**

One workshop per project after the development worker has been present on the field for at least 12-18 months.

**Participants of Level 1 Workshop:**
- 1 to 2 representatives of partner organisation/project
- 1 to 2 representatives of beneficiaries
- Development worker(s)
- Other actors depending on specific context
- Local facilitator
- A local facilitator has advantages and disadvantages, e.g. he will know the culture and the language. But this may also stop him from asking questions about the how and why someone has this or that opinion.
- Decide with him/her what is culturally appropriate but make clear that you really need cohesive explanations not just a collection of unrelated facts and opinions.

- 5-6 persons ideally, without facilitator
- Selection criteria: representativeness, feasibility and adequacy, considering that some countries are sensitive regarding religion, gender and tribal balance in a group
- Be aware that the workshops on project level will most likely be held in the local idiom, which may differ already in different areas of the same country. The facilitator should know the language well.
- Depending on the literacy rate in the country, the representatives of beneficiaries may be illiterate and/or also have problems in expressing themselves in the official language of the country.
- The starting point is not the project plan, but the dialog on confirmed changes
- Duration: 1 day. Be prepared to adapt to the local rhythm of working hours and maybe also to the public transport system for those participants that come from farther away
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time table (example)</th>
<th>Level 1 - Project/Partnership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08.30 - 09.00</td>
<td>Coffee and something to eat (that people arrive finally in time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.00 - 10.00</td>
<td>A. Story telling: share outstanding experiences of development worker’s work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.15 - 11.15</td>
<td>B. Concrete results of development worker’s work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30 - 13.00</td>
<td>C. Changes as results of development worker’s work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00 - 15.00</td>
<td>D. Impacts to which development worker’s work contributed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.15 - 16.05</td>
<td>E. SWOT analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.10 - 17.15</td>
<td>F. Conclusions and recommendations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.2. Preparations before the Workshop

Invite each stakeholder in advance of the workshop to think of a story or choose a recent example of how development service has brought about a significant change. Ask the participants to consider why the change has occurred, who was involved, what were the activities and the role of the development worker(s), who benefited from the changes and the difference it has made. They should bring the story with them on paper.

1.3. Level 1 – task A: Story telling about the effects of development workers' work

**What?**
Each participant shares a story or example that demonstrates how the assignment of the development worker brought about a significant change.

**Why?**
This exercise can be used as an icebreaker. It is a good introduction to the theme of the workshop and helps to build rapport amongst the participants.

**How?**
The facilitator should nominate someone to capture the key points from each of the stories and from the group discussions. A summary of the most significant story of change should be written up. Make sure to clarify any unclear points. Depending on how the development worker’s role is perceived in the community, the activities and results of the project and the worker may nearly overlap, especially if the development worker has been present since the start of the project and has a very visible role. On the contrary, if the development worker has a less public role it may be very difficult to establish the links between the assignment and the service of the project.

**Steps in the process**

**Step 1:** Ask each participant to spend 5 minutes sharing their story.

**Step 2:** After everyone has shared their story, invite the participants to share their impressions during a plenary discussion. The facilitator may want to help the discussion by asking prompt questions. For example:
- What seem to be the main activities that development workers have been involved in?
- What common themes seem to be arising from the stories about change and the role of the development worker(s)?
- What role did the development worker(s) play? Who else was involved?
- Who were the main beneficiaries (women, girls, boys, men, specific groups)?
- What types of changes have occurred as a direct result of the development worker(s)?
- How significant was the change? What difference has it made (overall contribution)?
- If the development worker(s) had not been involved, would this activity have happened?

**Step 3:** For the final part of this exercise, ask participants to discuss which story they feel best illustrates the contribution of the development worker(s) and why (Most Significant Change). It is important that they note down the reasons why. These provide useful criteria for later discussions on outcomes and overall contribution to development goals. The facilitator should attempt to synthesize the discussion, pulling out the most significant story or stories and any common themes and criteria identified.

- Result: Summary of the Most Significant Story (Final version: maximum 1 page A4)
- Duration: 60 min
- Make sure you receive all the stories that people prepared
1.4. Level 1 – task B: Direct/concrete results of development workers' work (output)

What?
A group exercise to learn more about the specific activities the development worker has carried out and the immediate results (outputs) of these activities.

Why?
To build on the stories shared in Exercise A and gather more information about the types of activities and outputs of the development worker placement and the development worker’s contribution.

How?
The facilitator will need to explain what an ‘output’ is (see box below). The facilitator can refer to the activities already identified during Exercise A to illustrate the types of activities and outputs of the development worker’s placement.

It is very important to clearly explain the terms used during the introduction for the workshop as people on this level very likely never heard them before and are rarely used to think in such categories. Visual aids as the one below may be of great help.

Sit together with the local facilitator before the workshop and discuss with him/her which local terms best capture the English terms ‘activity’, ‘output’, ‘outcome and ‘impact’. Agree to use them consistently during the workshop.

Adapt the explanation also to the topic of the workshop and the area of work of the development worker, respectively. This will help later to concentrate on the main topic and not spend valuable time with peripheral topics.

The facilitator should record the key outputs on a flipchart.

Someone should capture the key points from the group discussions.

**OUTPUTS:** Outputs are the concrete and direct results of a series of activities that are directly attributable to the development worker or the project/program. For example, the number of people trained, counselled, treated, etc. The number of pamphlets published, information leaflets produced etc. It is assumed that these activities will lead to the achievement of what the project is hoping to achieve overall (the project objectives). Some of these will be planned outputs (i.e. as per project plan) but there may well be results that were unplanned. See the Log frame example in Chapter D: Key concepts.

Drawing used to explain the relationship between activities, results, change and impact.
Steps in the process

Step 1: Ask participants to list all concrete and direct results (Outputs) from the stories shared in Exercise A. They can either write these on cards or call them out to the facilitator who will then write them up on cards or on a flipchart. Identify any other concrete and direct results.

Step 2: Draw a table on a flipchart. In the first column of the table you will place each of the key outputs. In the next column write whether the output was planned or unplanned.

Step 3: Decide on a method to rank the outputs in order of importance and/or effectiveness. You will need to agree what criteria you will use to judge what has been effective or is of importance. The facilitator may well have begun to draw this list up during the discussion of the previous Exercise A. The facilitator will need to ensure that she/he elicits views from all the participants and not just from a handful of more vocal participants. A very simple and quick way to rank the outputs is through a scoring method. Give each participant five/seven sticky dots. You might want to disaggregate by giving different coloured dots to women and men, development workers, non-development workers etc. Note down who has received which colour. Bias (very negative/very positive view of a participant) can be visualized with this method. Participants have the option to put all their dots onto one output or to spread the dots out over several outputs. Instruct the participants not to be led by others.

Step 4: After the participants have placed their dots, the facilitator should identify the outputs that have received the most and least dots. The facilitator leads a discussion with participants on the scores and the significance of the scores. They should try and get the participants to identify any trends emerging, the types of outputs that appear to be more important and/or effective. It is important to note down the different perspectives and views.

Tips: Remember there will be very different perspectives on what constitutes an ‘effective’ output. Participants may find it confusing to rank and/or score the order of importance of the development worker outputs without a more in depth discussion on the outcomes and results of the activities. Participants are likely to want to discuss other factors that might have contributed to these changes, including their role, and other internal/external factors.

- Duration: 60 min
- Result: A table/chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct/concrete results (output)</th>
<th>Planned or not?</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.5. Level 1 – Task C: Changes (outcome)

What?
A group exercise to identify the changes brought about by development service during the placement.

Why?
This exercise builds on Exercise B and begins to connect the development worker activities and outputs to the changes that have resulted (expected and unexpected).

How?
Ensure all participants understand what an ‘outcome’ is: real and effective changes in attitudes, methodologies, strategies etc., always in relation to a specific stakeholder (see the box below). The facilitator can refer to the outputs identified during Exercise B as the starting point to discuss what changes have happened as a result of these activities. The facilitator records the key outcomes with respect to the changes with different stakeholder groups. Once this has been done, the facilitator will support participants to explore and discuss in more depth how the development worker contributed to these changes, any key challenges and key disappointments, whether the changes were intended or not (based on the placement/project objectives).

Someone should capture the key points from the group discussions.

The challenge consists in trying to reconstruct the link between the direct/concrete results (output) and the outcomes as well as to identify the contribution of the development worker(s) in the change.

OUTCOMES:
These are actual changes/benefits brought about by development workers through working with different stakeholders. They reflect the development of self-reliance.

Essentially, we are looking at qualitative change, for example:
- Changes in attitudes, ideas, awareness or behaviour
- Social, cultural, political or personal change
- Individual, group, community, organisational or institutional change
- Changes in practice, priorities, resources or systems
- Changes in roles, relationships, responsibilities, communications
- Changes at micro or macro level, in a specific sector or cross-sectoral

See examples of types of changes that we expect to see for different stakeholders in Appendix 4.

Steps in the process
Step 1: Ask participants to spend five minutes on their own to think about the changes that have taken place as a result of the development worker activities. These might be changes that the development workers have contributed to with others, or they might be changes that have resulted as a culmination of several development worker and project activities. The changes might be personal changes, organisational changes, changes in the community etc. They might be positive or negative changes. The changes might be intended or unintended. The changes might be on a very small scale or a large scale. Ask participants to write down the changes on separate cards. Ask participants to think about which stakeholders have been affected by these changes. Show a list with possible stakeholders.
Step 2: The facilitator prepares a flipchart paper with a template chart (see below). The facilitator will ask each participant in turn to call out one key change and writes this on the flipchart. Participants will decide which stakeholder group(s) the change refers to. Once everyone has called out a change, ask whether there are any additional (important) changes they would like to add to the list. The facilitator’s role is to probe the responses of the participants and reach further clarity on the type of change that has taken place, whether it was planned or not, positive or negative, and who benefited (men, women, girls, boys, marginalized groups etc.). Make sure you get concrete changes. ‘People have changed their behaviour’ is not a concrete change, but a category of change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Changes (outcome)</th>
<th>Contributions of development worker</th>
<th>Comments: Were the changes positive or negative? Or other incidents, occurrences?</th>
<th>Were the changes planned or unplanned?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Step 3: Once you have listed all the outcomes, ask the participants to discuss the following questions:

- Identify HOW development service has contributed to the key changes (i.e. identifying the exact role of development service within the changes brought about)
- Were there positive or negative, planned or unplanned outcomes as a result of these changes?
- Would the change have happened without the presence of the development worker?
- Any other observations you would like to add?

Step 4: The facilitator will need to consolidate the key outcomes on the chart.

TIPS: The facilitator should make it clear to participants that any discussion of negative changes that might have occurred during the development worker’s placement is not intended to be a blame making exercise. The idea is to get a better understanding of some of the unintended consequences of our activities so that we can learn to improve future projects and programmes. Likewise, any discussion on the contributions that different types of development workers can make has the objective to improve/enhance future placement strategies and is not an assessment or critique of individual development workers. Negative changes are therefore very important to include as well, though asking people to name them may be a delicate point. Discuss in the preparation session with the local facilitator about culturally appropriate ways of obtaining those answers, too. Take care that not all positive changes are automatically attributed to the project’s goals, discuss with the group if that really was the case.

✓ Duration: 90 min
✓ Result: a table/chart
1.6. Level 1 – Task D: Impacts (long-term changes)

What?
A group exercise to identify the impacts for different stakeholders brought about by the project/partner organisation and by development service during the placement.

Why?
This exercise builds on Exercise C and tries to establish the link between changes (outcomes) and impacts, taking into account the activities of the project/partner organisation just as well as the contribution of the development worker.

How?
Ensure all participants understand what an ‘impact’ is. The facilitator can refer to the outcomes identified during Exercise C as the starting point to discuss what contribution the outcomes made to the impacts. The facilitator records the key impacts per sector (Health/Vocational Training) with respect to the different stakeholder groups. Once this has been done, the facilitator will support participants to explore and discuss in more depth how development service and projects can contribute to the sector goals. Therefore, shortly explain the Sector goals from the Institutional Program.

The Sector goals of the Institution Programme should be well enough defined to be used in this workshop-level. In addition, the composition of the group should be considered whether (or not) to include this information in the explanations. Maybe none of the participants has ever heard about an Institution Programme before. The task D works also without this.

Someone should capture the key points from the group discussions.

The challenge consists in trying to reconstruct the link between changes (outcomes) and the impacts taking into account the activities of the project/partner organisation just as well as the contribution of the development worker.

**Impacts:**
Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.  
E.g. reduced infant mortality, higher quality of life index for handicapped people, etc.

**Steps in the process**

**Step 1:** Start with shortly presenting the Institution Program’s focus on the topic of Health/Vocational Training, respectively.

**Step 2:** Ask participants to spend five minutes on their own to think about the impacts that have taken place as a result of the development worker’s and the project’s activities. These might be impacts that the development worker has contributed to with others, or they might be impacts that have resulted as a culmination of several development workers and project activities. Ask participants to write down the impacts on separate cards. Ask participants to think about which stakeholders have been affected by these impacts. At what level is it possible to detect the impacts? At the level of projects, beneficiaries, public policy or society in general (= question for discussion)?

**Step 3:** The facilitator prepares a flipchart paper with a template chart (see below). The facilitator will ask each participant in turn to call out one key impact and writes this on the flipchart. Participants will decide which stakeholder group(s) the impact refers to. Once everyone has called out an impact, ask whether there are any additional (important) impacts they would like to add to the list. The facilitator’s role is to probe the responses
of the participants and reach further clarity on the type of impact that has taken place, and who contributed to it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Vocational Training / Health</th>
<th>Contributions of development worker and project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observed impacts among beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed impacts in the context of public policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Step 4:** Once you have listed all the impacts, ask the participants to discuss the following questions:
- In what way, do you think, the placement or project has contributed to the longer-term goals highlighted in the presentation?
- How might the development worker placement and/or project contribute to these goals in the future?
- Any other observations you would like to add?

**Step 5:** The facilitator will need to consolidate the key impacts on the chart.

**TIPS:** The facilitator should make it clear to participants that any discussion on the contributions that either development worker or project has made will be used to improve/enhance the objective of future placement strategies and is not an assessment or critique of individual development workers or projects.

- ✓ Duration: 60 min
- ✓ Result: a table/chart
1.7. Level 1 – Task E: SWOT Analysis of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats

What?
This is a participatory tool that can be used to analyse the strengths and weaknesses, opportunities and threats of the project or placement.

Why?
To look at the factors which facilitate or constrain the development worker in achieving the placement/project objectives.

How?
Assure that all participants understand what a SWOT Analysis is. Draw up a SWOT chart on a flipchart. Use coloured post-its/coloured cards. Use the colours to capture who wrote what.

Discuss before the workshop with the local facilitator what local terms best capture the idea of strength, weakness, opportunity and threat. Make sure to use them consistently. In Ethiopia for example, the facilitator suggested instead of weaknesses ‘points for improvement’. He could not be convinced to use ‘weaknesses’. Eventhough this leaves out the first step of the analysis (what is not good), it helped to start then the discussion of how to overcome the weakness.

You may find it easier to address all four factors simultaneously. SW factors are often used to refer to internal aspects of the placement, while OT factors address issues external to the employing organisation. (See chart below)

The aim of any SWOT analysis is to identify the key internal and external factors that are important to achieve the objectives. SWOT analysis groups key pieces of information into two main categories:

- Internal factors – The strengths and weaknesses internal to the organisation.
- External factors – The opportunities and threats presented by the external environment.

Someone should capture the key points from the group discussions.

Steps in the process

Step 1: Ask the participants to:
- List the key strengths of the placement/project (internal). Write each strength on a card and stick them to the chart labelled ‘strengths’.
- List the key weaknesses of the placement/project (internal). Write each weakness on a card and stick them to the chart labelled ‘weaknesses’.
- List the key threats to the placement/project (external). Write each threat on a card and stick them to the chart labelled ‘threats’.
- List the key opportunities for the placement/project (external). Write each opportunity on a card and tape them to the chart labelled ‘opportunities’.

Step 2: Review each category separately and try to reduce the list in each category and/or rank in order of importance.

Step 3: Invite the participants to discuss the findings of the SWOT Analysis, and discuss in more detail the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats and the reasons why. Ask participants to give concrete examples. Make sure that you understand why participants mention a certain point. Unexplained facts can be very difficult to interpret later. Moreover, they cannot be improved!

Step 4: Ask participants which of the most critical issues need to be resolved and how the issues might be addressed.

Step 5: Make sure to write down the SWOT cards and key points from the discussion.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal strengths and weaknesses (level of development worker(s) and project team):</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External opportunities and threats (partner organisation and its context)</td>
<td>Opportunities</td>
<td>Threats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting from the strengths and the detected opportunities: What are the consequences, the actions arising from the evaluation? What are the recommendations to better use the strengths and opportunities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting from the weaknesses and the detected threats: What are the consequences, the actions arising from the evaluation? What are the recommendations to overcome the weaknesses and the threats?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Duration: 50 min
- Result: SWOT chart with recommendations
1.8. Level 1 – Task F: Key Lessons and Recommendations

What?
Pulling together overall key lessons and recommendations.

Why?
The exercise builds on the SWOT analysis to prioritize key recommendations for the individual placement.

How?
Make sure with the local facilitator which local terms best capture the idea of key lesson and key recommendation. Make sure to use those terms consistently.

Participants may use this point to express their personal wish list for the project. It should do this or that and offer this additional service, etc. What may work better to obtain less biased opinions is if you ask them to imagine a new project, with the same area of work somewhere in another corner of the country. Then ask them to consider all that was discussed during the day and answer the following questions:

- What should be done the same way, what should be copied from the existing project?
- What should be done differently, better?
- If they could give their advice, what would be the most important thing that should be observed when starting this new project?

Participants should identify at least one recommendation that can be usefully shared at the Sector Level Assessment Workshop.

Someone should capture the key points from the group discussions.

Steps in the process
Step 1: Ask participants to come up with a set of five key lessons and five key recommendations for the future of the placement/project. These should build on:
- The overall workshop analysis of key achievements (Exercises A-D)
- The strengths and opportunities identified (Exercise E SWOT)
- Addressing the weaknesses and threats identified (Exercise E SWOT)

Write up the key lessons and recommendations on the flipchart.

Step 2: Ask participants to prioritize the key recommendations that can be usefully shared at the Sector Level Assessment workshop.

Step 3: The facilitator feeds back overall conclusions from the workshop and from this last session, and explains how the findings will feed into the Sector Level Assessment Workshop.

Step 4: The facilitator nominates or invites someone to write up the flipchart lessons and recommendations in a systematic way on a sheet of paper.

TIPS: At the end of the workshop, it is good practice to carry out an evaluation of the workshop for learning purposes.

It is important to explain what will happen with the results.
Encourage also the project representatives to share what they learned with the project team. People can always use some encouragement and a fresh look at the fruit of their work.

- Duration: 50 min
- Result: List of prioritized actions
2. Level 2: Sector Programme

2.1. General Information

The workshops of the second level are organized in transnational groups according to the sectors in question. The main challenge of the second level is not to sum up the results, the changes or the impacts but rather to search for a way to systematize and combine the results, changes and impacts of a specific sector program. This should result in more than just the sum of the different parts.

To be able to realize this systematization of the results, changes and impacts on the sector programme level, we must visualize the essential elements of the implementation of the program. The key question is this: What are the verifiable effects regarding synergy, complementarity and logic that are common for all the projects and partner relationships in the particular sector programme?

The institutional programme of MN contains three specific sectors: food security, health and education as well as a transversal topic, peace and reconciliation. Usually the different projects have one major thematic focus with additional elements from one or two of the other sectors.

It is obvious that concentrating on a sector does not automatically produce any effect in itself. Additionally, there is a great risk that the “sector programme” is nothing but the simple addition of projects with similar topics. To increase the possibility to achieve the desired effects in a sector, it is necessary to work with consolidated strategic relationships of the partner organisations (learn from each other, exchange ideas, share problems and solutions).

That a workshop at the sector programme level results in useful recommendations, the sector programme should be well developed. It should contain goals that are well defined at the outcome and impact level. Output oriented goals will not be a good starting point for the workshop.

Objectives for Level 2 Workshops

- Exchange the results from Level 1 workshops
- Regroup the results to:
  - Identify the common elements of the contribution of the development workers (output)
  - Identify the common elements in the outcomes and impacts
- Identify the links, the complementarities and the synergies between the different projects (the sum of the sector programme vision)
- Draw conclusions for the further development of the sector programme (conclusions, lessons learnt, and perspectives).

Participants of Level 2 workshops

- 1 Representative of each partner/project
- Development workers
- Country co-ordinator
- Invited people if the co-ordinators believe it to be appropriate
- Responsible person for the sector programme from the CH-office
- Facilitator
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time table (example)</th>
<th>Level 2 – Sector Programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08.00 – 09.00</td>
<td>Coffee and something to eat (that people arrive finally in time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08.30 – 09.00</td>
<td>Level 1 representatives prepare their presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.00 – 09.30</td>
<td>Introduction of the participants, introduction to the workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.30 – 10.30</td>
<td>A. Recapitulation of level 1 workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00 – 12.30</td>
<td>B. Outputs, outcomes and impacts grouping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.30 – 15.00</td>
<td>C. SWOT Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.30 – 16.30</td>
<td>D. Lessons Learnt and Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.30 – 17.00</td>
<td>Feedback, summary of what they take home for their work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.2. Preparations before the Workshops

- Distribute background-reading material like SDG goals and Sector/Institution Programme well in advance.
- Distribute the reports from level 1 workshops to the different participants. Each participant receives only the report that corresponds to the workshop in which he/she participated.
- The participants from level 1 workshops prepare a symbolic story (taken from those shared during level 1 workshops; this story shall be related in a free manner: orally, drawings, etc.)
- The participants from level 1 workshops prepare on one page a systematic summary of the most important outputs, outcomes and impacts identified in the level 1 workshop (maximum five outputs, 7 outcomes – 1 for each stakeholder – and 5 impacts according to the following chart).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
<td>Outcome per stakeholder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Development worker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Partner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Partner Network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 In Switzerland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7 Others)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3. Level 2 – Task A: Recapitulation of Level 1 workshops

What?
Sharing experiences and lessons from the project level workshops. Recapitulating the most important results from level 1 workshops by each team (development worker plus partner/project representative).

Why?
This exercise can be used as an icebreaker. It is a good introduction to the theme of the workshop and helps to build rapport amongst the participants as well as link this workshop to the project level workshop.

How?
Lessons and change stories are shared in the group. The facilitator pulls together a synthesis of key outcomes/stories and lessons.

Steps in the process
**Step 1:** The facilitator distributes to the representatives of level 1 workshops some sheets of paper (a different colour for each level 1 workshop)
**Step 2:** The representatives of level 1 workshops write down on those papers the contents of the sheet on which they had summed up the most important points from their level 1 workshop. It is important to write with big letters and one idea on each sheet of paper only.
**Step 3:** The representatives decide how to present the systematized version of their chosen story to the plenary
**Step 4:** The facilitator prepares a big sheet on which all the small sheets are to be placed. It is important to have sufficient space in order to be able to fix them on the wall or to arrange them on the ground according to the following chart. (Step 1 – 4 should not exceed 30 minutes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
<td>Outcome per stakeholder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Development worker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Partner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Partner Network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 In Switzerland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7 Others)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Step 5:** The representatives from level 1 workshops present their summaries: Each team presents its story and places the papers (output, outcomes and impacts) on the chart prepared by the facilitator.

**Step 6:** After sharing the stories, the group participants can ask questions to each other regarding the stories. They should identify and agree on the type of changes for each story.

**Step 7:** At the end of the presentations, the facilitator takes a picture of the collective chart (It is important to do this before Task B!)

- Duration steps 1 – 4: about 30 minutes
- Recapitulation of level 1 workshops: 10 min per project level workshop team
- The time in plenum should not exceed 60 minutes. Total duration of task A: maximum 90 min
- Result: Picture the chart with the outputs, outcomes, impacts
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2.4. Level 2 – Task B: Outputs, outcomes and impacts grouping

What?
Classify the outputs, outcomes and impacts in categories.

Why?
This exercise helps to better understand the context and the concerned parties.

How?
This is a group exercise for all participants. In three consecutives parts the different levels of results are analysed and categorized according to important categories.

B1: OUTPUTS
Steps in the process
Step 1: The facilitator proposes the categories to classify the outputs:
- Concerned people
- Instruments
- Methods
- In Switzerland
- Other possible categories (in consultation with participants)

Step 2: The participants approve of the proposed categories.

Step 2: The facilitator suggests different possibilities to rearrange the papers according to the chosen categories, always in consultation with the participants who can express their approval or disapproval.

| Output | Category 1 | Category 2 | ...
|--------|------------|------------|-------|

B2: OUTCOMES
Steps in the process
Step 1: The facilitator proposes categories to classify the outcomes
- Knowledge (head)
- Attitudes (heart)
- Behaviour (hand)

Step 2: The participants approve of the proposed categories.

Step 3: The facilitator suggests different possibilities to rearrange the papers according to the three categories, always in consultation with the participants who can express their approval or disapproval.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Attitudes</th>
<th>Behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Development worker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Project team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Partner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Partner network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 In Switzerland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7 Others)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B3: IMPACT**

**Step 1:** The facilitator proposes categories to classify the impact
- Public politics
- Public administration
- Means of communication – public opinion
- Population
- In Switzerland
- Others (in agreement with the plenum)

**Step 2:** The participants approve of the proposed categories.

**Step 3:** The facilitator suggests different possibilities to rearrange the papers according to the different impact categories, always in consultation with the participants who can express their approval or disapproval.

**Step 4:** At the end, the facilitator takes a picture of the whole production.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Duration of each period (B1, B2, B3): around 30 min
- Total duration of task B: maximum 90 minutes
- Result: Pictures of chart with categorized outputs, outcomes, impacts
2.5. Level 2 – TASK C: SWOT Analysis

What?
This is a participatory tool that can be used to identify the (most important) elements which facilitate (+) or complicate (-) the implementation of the sector programme. It is the basis to plan strategies to reinforce the positive elements and overcome/minimize the negative elements.

Why?
To look at the factors which facilitate or constrain the achievement of the sector goals.

How?
Assure that all participants understand what a SWOT Analysis is.
The aim of any SWOT analysis is to identify the key internal and external factors that are important to achieve the objectives. SWOT analysis groups key pieces of information into two main categories:
- Internal factors – The strengths and weaknesses internal to the organisation.
- External factors – The opportunities and threats presented by the external environment.

Draw up a SWOT chart on a flipchart. Use coloured post-its/coloured cards. Someone should capture the key points from the group discussions.

Step 1: Group work: The participants of level 1 workshops select from the SWOT analysis of level 1 workshops three positive elements (strength and opportunities) and three negative elements (weaknesses and threats) which they judge to be the most important ones. These might be internal and external factors.

Step 2: They should write each selected positive or negative element on a single coloured card and prepare also the arguments for the selection so that they can present them to the plenary.

Step 3: The facilitator prepares a big SWOT frame that will be fixed on another wall.

Step 4: In plenum: each group places its papers into the correct place in the frame and explains why they chose it.

Step 5: The facilitator helps to arrange the papers according to their positive or negative aspect

Step 4–5: Duration 20 minutes

Step 6: Brainstorming: Discuss the possible strategies to reinforce the positive aspects and overcome/minimize the negative aspects.

Step 7: The facilitator systematizes and sums up the suggestions and propositions mentioned during the discussion.

Step 8: The facilitator takes a picture of the final result.

Duration of step 1-3: maximum 20 minutes
Duration of step 4-5: maximum 20 minutes
Duration of step 6-8: about 40 minutes
Total duration of step 1-8: about 90 minutes
Result: SWOT Analysis with recommendations
2.6. Level 2 – TASK D: Lessons Learnt and Recommendations

What?
Reflecting together on the sector programme approach and drawing together key lessons and recommendations for the organisation.

Why?
Provides results from the workshop that the organisation can use in future strategic planning.

How?
Time for open and free reflection in the group to draw out recommendations from the data generated throughout the day.

Steps in the process
Step 1: The facilitator presents the characteristic of the sector programme with the overarching goals and objectives.

Step 2: What can we do to reinforce the programmatic approach of the organisation? How can we capitalize on our experience more strategically to influence development interventions and approaches?

Step 3: Formulate conclusion, recommendations and practical/concrete actions. What are the key lessons and the corresponding action points? The facilitator notes down the key lessons and actions on a flipchart.

Step 4: The facilitator coordinates and sums up the reflections and the propositions.

✓ Total duration of task D: around 60 minutes
✓ Result: Key Lessons and Recommendations for the sector programme
3. Level 3: Institution Programme

3.1 General Information

Like the workshops on level 2 – sector programmes, the workshop on level 3 – institution programme, is not meant to be just the sum of the sector programmes. Rather, it aims at finding the common denominators of the different sector programmes and to explore the contribution the institution itself adds to the process of change in the south as well as the north. The idea to consolidate the different sector programmes assumes the assumption that ‘1’ + ‘1’ equals more than ‘2’: that a sector programme me is more than just the sum of the projects and that the institution programme is more than the sum of all existing sector programmes. A programme is more than just the sum of its parts. It is a structure that is formed from different complementary parts that interact and are coherent and synergistic. It has a clear profile and is well defined.

Consequently, this workshop aims at systematizing and synthetizing the effects of the programme, starting with the work already done during the workshops on level 1 and 2. On this third level we try to extract the thought and conclusions and to obtain a qualitative analysis of the effects of the institution programme. In this sense, the workshop presents itself as a key moment for two reasons. First, drawing conclusions from the reflections of the previous two levels allows to realize the contribution the institution programme had in those results.

Second, the analysis of the workshop aims at giving directions for the further development of the institution programme. The verification of effects in a specific phase of the programme does not only reveal what kind of results the institution programme produces, but also tries to contribute to the further development of the programme vision that it may continue to develop.

Objectives for Level 3 Workshops

- Exchange the results from level 2 workshops
- Regroup the results to:
  - Identify the common elements in the direct contribution to the sector programme
  - Identify the common elements in change of behaviour to which the sector programmes have contributed (outcome and impact)
- Identify the links, the complementarities and the synergies between the different partner organisations and sector programmes (the elements that contribute to the programme vision)
- Draw conclusions for the further development of the sector programmes and institution programme (conclusions, lessons learnt, and perspectives).

Participants of Level 3 workshop

- Country co-ordinators
- Responsible persons for the sectors from the CH-office
- Responsible person for the institution programs from the CH-office
- Outside expert: a person that knows the international context of development cooperation. The idea is to provide a critical and objective analysis of the verified effects.
- Further guests if it is deemed necessary
- Facilitator
# 3.2 Preparations before the Workshops

- Distribute background-reading material like SDG goals and Sector/Institution Programme well in advance.
- Distribute the reports from level 2 workshops to the different participants. Each participant receives only the report that corresponds to the workshop in which he/she participated.
- The participants from level 2 workshops prepare a symbolic story (taken from those shared during level 1 workshops; this story shall be related in a free manner: orally, drawings, etc.)
- The participants from level 2 workshops (consequently the country co-ordinator and the persons responsible for the sectors) prepare on one page a systematic summary of the most important outputs, outcomes and impacts identified in the level 2 workshop (maximum five outputs, 7 outcomes – 1 for each stakeholder – and 5 impacts according to the following chart). From the point of view of the sector programmes, they prepare an analytical synthesis of the workshops on level 2, trying to tease out the common elements and the aspects that are most important regarding the institution program. The key question is: what are the impacts that stand out the most in a specific program. They should use the same chart as the one from workshop level 2. They should prepare their presentation in agreement with the responsible person for the institution program.
- Before the workshop, they write the content from their table on single sheets of paper. It is important to use one single sheet for each idea. Each sector uses one specific colour.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
<td>Outcome per stakeholder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Development worker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Partner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Partner Network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 In Switzerland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7 Others)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 Level 3 – Task A: Recapitulation of Level 2 workshops

What?
Sharing experiences and lessons from the sector level workshops. Recapitulating the most important results from level 2 workshops by country co-ordinator and person responsible for a sector

Why?
This exercise can be used as an icebreaker. It is a good introduction to the theme of the workshop and helps to build rapport amongst the participants as well as link this workshop to the sector level workshop.

How?
Lessons and change stories are shared in the group. The facilitator pulls together a synthesis of key outcomes/stories and lessons.

Steps in the process

Step 1: The facilitator maps out a big space according to the table below. It is important to calculate enough space, a big board or even the floor can be used. The outline can be done with strings or with tape.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
<td>Outcome per stakeholder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Development worker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Partner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Partner Network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 In Switzerland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7 Others)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 2: The summaries are presented: Each team presents its story and places the papers (output, outcomes and impacts) on the chart prepared by the facilitator.

Step 3: At the end of the presentations, the facilitator takes a picture of the collective chart

- Duration: about 10-15 minutes for each co-ordinator, maximum 60 minutes
- Result: Picture of outputs, outcomes, impacts

Step 4: Debate with the external expert

The expert presents his/her critical analysis. (Is the verification of the systematized effects satisfactory? Is the self-analysis pertinent and adequate? Is the chain of effects coherent and does it make sense?)

Step 5: The facilitator leads the discussion with the participants about the analysis of the expert.

- Duration: Step 4 max 30 min, total duration of task A max 120 minutes
- Result: pictures of the chart.
3.4 Level 3 – Task B: SWOT Analysis

What?
This is a participatory tool that can be used to identify the (most important) elements which facilitate (+) or complicate (-) the implementation of the sector program. It is the basis to plan strategies to reinforce the positive elements and overcome/minimize the negative elements.

Why?
To look at the factors which facilitate or constrain the achievement of the objectives of the institution program.

How?
Assure that all participants understand what a SWOT Analysis is.
The aim of any SWOT analysis is to identify the key internal and external factors that are important to achieve the objectives. SWOT analysis groups key pieces of information into two main categories:
- Internal factors – The strengths and weaknesses internal to the organisation.
- External factors – The opportunities and threats presented by the external environment.
Prepare a SWOT chart. Use coloured post-its/coloured cards corresponding to the sector. Someone should capture the key points from the group discussions.

Step 1: Group work: The participants of level 2 workshops (country co-ordinator s and the one responsible for the sector program) select from the SWOT analysis of workshop level 2 three positive elements (strength and opportunities) and three negative elements (weaknesses and threats) which they judge to be the most important ones. These might be internal and external factors.
Step 2: They should write each selected positive or negative element on one of the coloured cards and prepare also the arguments for the selection so that they can present them to the plenary.
Step 3: The facilitator prepares a big SWOT frame that will be fixed on a wall or laid out on the floor.  
Step 1 – 3: Duration maximum 30 minutes.
Step 4: In plenum: each group places its papers into the correct place in the frame and explains why they chose it.
Step 5: The facilitator helps to arrange the papers thematically.
Step 4-5: Duration maximum 30 minutes

Step 6: Brainstorming: Discuss the possible strategies to reinforce the positive aspects and overcome/minimize the negative aspects.
Step 7: The facilitator systematizes and sums up the suggestions and propositions mentioned during the discussion.
Step 8: The facilitator takes a picture of the final result

✓ Duration of step 1-3: maximum 30 minutes
✓ Duration of step 4-5: maximum 30 minutes
✓ Duration of step 6-8: about 60 minutes
✓ Total duration of task C: maximum 120 minutes
✓ Result: SWOT Analysis and recommendations
3.5 Level 3 – Task C: Lessons Learnt and Recommendations

What?
Reflecting together on the sector programme approach and drawing together key lessons and recommendations for the organisation.

Why?
Provides results from the workshop that the organisation can use in future strategic planning.

How?
Time for open and free reflection in the group to draw out recommendations from the data generated throughout the day.

Steps in the process

Step 1: The responsible person for the institution programme from the CH-office sums up again the idea of an institution programme (more than the sum of its parts) and how this fits with the way the organisation works (the interplay of the different sectors and topics).

Step 2: The external expert presents a critical reflection about the programmatic approach and the daily work of the organisation:
- How far does the current institution programme already reflect the different aspects of a programmatic vision?
- What are the elements that enable the organisation to work with a programmatic approach and what would strengthen this approach?

Step 3: Discussion in plenum along the following questions:
- What can we do to strengthen the programmatic approach to our work?
- What are the conclusions we take into the next phase of the programme for our organisation?

Formulate conclusion, recommendations and practical/concrete actions. What are the key lessons and the corresponding action points? The facilitator notes down the key lessons and next steps on a flipchart.

Step 4: The facilitator coordinates the discussion and sums up the reflections and propositions.

✓ Total duration of task D: around 120 minutes
✓ Result: Key Lessons and Recommendations for the institution programme of the organisation
Appendix 1: Glossary

Accountability
Obligation to demonstrate that work has been conducted in compliance with agreed rules and standards or to report fairly and accurately on performance results vis-à-vis mandated roles and/or plans. This may require a careful, even legally defensible, demonstration that the work is consistent with the contract terms.

Note: Accountability in development may refer to the obligations of partners to act according to clearly defined responsibilities, roles and performance expectations, often with respect to the prudent use of resources. For evaluators, it connotes the responsibility to provide accurate, fair and credible monitoring reports and performance assessments. For public sector managers and policy-makers, accountability is to taxpayers/citizens.

Activity:
Actions taken or work performed through which inputs, such as funds, technical assistance and other types of resources are mobilized to produce specific outputs. Actions required in order to achieve objectives.

Assumptions:
Hypotheses about factors or risks, which could affect the progress or success of a development intervention.

Note: Assumptions can also be understood as hypothesized conditions that bear on the validity of the evaluation itself, e.g., about the characteristics of the population when designing a sampling procedure for a survey. Assumptions are made explicit in theory-based evaluations where evaluation tracks systematically the anticipated results chain.

Attribution:
The ascription of a causal link between observed (or expected to be observed) changes and a specific intervention.

Base-line study:
An analysis describing the situation prior to a development intervention, against which progress can be assessed or comparisons made.

Beneficiaries:
The individuals, groups, or organisations, whether targeted or not, that benefit, directly or indirectly, from the development intervention.

Disaggregate:
Analyse data according to different groupings to show differences between certain groups (e.g. gender, age, ethnic group etc.)

Effect:
Intended or unintended change due directly or indirectly to an intervention.

Effectiveness:
The extent to which the development intervention objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.

Efficiency:
A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results.
Evaluation:
The systematic and objective assessment of an ongoing or completed project, programme or policy, its design, implementation and results. The aim is to determine the relevance and fulfilment of objectives, development efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. An evaluation should provide information that is credible and useful, enabling the incorporation of lessons learned into the decision-making process of both recipients and donors. Evaluation also refers to the process of determining the worth or significance of an activity, policy or programme. An assessment, as systematic and objective as possible, of a planned, on-going, or completed development intervention.

Evaluation Criteria:
The evaluation object is normally measured against the five DAC-criteria, with different blends of importance:
1. Relevance: Use value in context
2. Efficiency: Relation of resources (Inputs) to results (Outputs)
3. Effectiveness: Target and result achievement (Outcomes)
4. Impact: Development implications on systems level, direct or indirect, positive and negative
5. Sustainability: Lasting economic, social and environmental benefits

Feedback:
Presenting findings.

Goal:
The overall development objective to which a set of interventions will contribute. Goals are statements of intended future changes in relation to the key problem or issue to be addressed. The timeframe for achieving the goal will often be much longer than the intervention period.

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

Impact Assessment:
Understanding the wider intended and unintended changes brought about as a result of a given intervention and the different effects of these changes on women, men, girls and boys. Impact Assessment also involves
understanding how and to what extent development interventions influence the socio-economic and political situation of a society.

**Indicator:**
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 to assess the performance of a development actor.

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

**Intervention:**
External or internal action intended to influence or change a situation.

**Lessons learned:**
Generalizations based on evaluation experiences with projects, programmes, or policies that abstract from the specific circumstances to broader situations. Frequently, lessons highlight strengths or weaknesses in preparation, design and implementation that affect performance, outcome and impact.

**Logical framework (Log frame):**
Management tool used to improve the design of interventions, most often at the project level. It involves identifying strategic elements (inputs, outputs, outcomes, impact) and their causal relationships, indicators, and the assumptions or risks that may influence success and failure. It thus facilitates planning, execution and evaluation of a development intervention. (See appendix 2)

**Most Significant Change Stories:**
Exemplary stories that capture the essence of observed changes.

**Monitoring:**
A continuing function that uses systematic collection of data on specified indicators to provide management and the main stakeholders of an ongoing development intervention with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of objectives and progress in the use of allocated funds.

**Objective:**
What we want to achieve; the desired outcome of an activity. They are a level down from a goal. Objectives are statements that describe in clear terms the intended changes or steps that the intervention will take towards achieving the overall goal.

**Outcome mapping:**
Outcome Mapping (OM) focuses on one particular category of results: changes in the behaviour of people, groups, and organisations with whom a programme works directly. These changes are called "outcomes". Through the OM method, development programmes can claim contributions to the achievement of outcomes rather than claiming the achievement (attribution) of development impacts. OM helps to analyse complex changes, especially those relating to behaviour and knowledge. (See appendix 4)

**Outcomes:**
The effects or visible results of an activity or intervention
Outputs:
The products, capital goods and services that result from a development intervention; may also include changes resulting from the intervention which are relevant to the achievement of outcomes. The immediate and specific results of the input – this is typically (but not necessarily) quantifiable.

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, program, or policy is being implemented against expected results.

Project or programme objective:
The intended physical, financial, institutional, social, environmental or other development results to which a project or programme is expected to contribute.

Purpose:
The publicly stated objectives of the development programme or project.

Relevance:
The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners and donors' policies.

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

Results-Based Management (RBM):
A management strategy focusing on performance and achievement of outputs, outcomes and impacts.

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, and feedback. In some agencies, research is part of the results chain. (See graphic in Appendix 3)

Results framework
The programme logic that explains how the development objective is to be achieved, including causal relationships and underlying assumptions.

Review:
An assessment of the performance of an intervention, periodically or on an ad hoc basis.
Note: Frequently "evaluation" is used for a more comprehensive and/or more in-depth assessment than "review". Reviews tend to emphasize operational aspects. Sometimes the terms "review" and "evaluation" are used as synonyms.

Risk analysis:
An analysis or an assessment of factors (called assumptions in the log frame) affect or are likely to affect the successful achievement of an intervention objective. A detailed examination of the potential unwanted and negative consequences to human life, health, property, or the environment posed by development interven-
tions; a systematic process to provide information regarding such undesirable consequences; the process of quantification of the probabilities and expected impacts for identified risks.

**SWOT analysis:**
A participatory tool that can be used to analyse the strengths and weaknesses, opportunities and threats of a project or placement. SWOT\(^1\) is a basic, straightforward model that assesses what can and what cannot be done as well as the potential opportunities and threats. With this information, it helps to plan further activities to achieve the desired results.

**Stakeholders:**
Literally the individuals, organisations or categories of people who have a ‘stake’ or an interest in the work. These include both internal and external stakeholders.

**Target group:**
The specific individuals or organisations for whose benefit the development intervention is undertaken.

**Theory of Change**
Theory of Change is essentially a comprehensive description and illustration of how and why a desired change is expected to happen in a particular context. It is focused in particular on mapping out or “filling in” what has been described as the “missing middle” between what a programme or change initiative does (its activities or interventions) and how these lead to desired goals being achieved. It does this by first identifying the desired long-term goals and then works back from these to identify all the conditions (outcomes) that must be in place (and how these related to one another causally) for the goals to occur. These are all mapped out in an Outcomes Framework (pathway of change).

**Triangulation:**
The use of three or more theories, sources or types of information, or types of analysis to verify and substantiate an assessment.
**Note:** by combining multiple data-sources, methods, analyses or theories, evaluators seek to overcome the bias that comes from single informants, single methods, single observer or single theory studies.

---

\(^1\) French: succès – échecs – potentiels – obstacles (SEPO)
Spanish: fortalezas – oportunidades – debilidades – amenazas (FODA)
Appendix 2: The Logical Framework Analysis (LFA) Approach

The participatory assessment methodology of UNV/E-Changer builds on the Logical Framework Analysis approach (LFA). LFA or log frames are used worldwide by national and international agencies for planning and evaluation of development activities. This can be at the organisation, programme or project level. International development service organisations are more and more commonly using the LFA, in line with the methodologies and requirements of their donor agencies.

LFA looks like a table (or framework) and aims to present information about the key components of a project in a clear, concise, logical and systematic way.

The framework includes:

- What the project should achieve, from the level of overall goal down to specific objectives
- The performance questions/indicators that will be used to monitor progress
- How the indicators will be monitored or how the data will be collected
- The assumptions behind the logic of how activities will eventually contribute to the goal
- The associated risks

The advantages of using the LFA include the following:

- LFA provides a handy summary to inform project staff, donors, beneficiaries and other stakeholders, which can be referred to throughout the lifecycle of the project/program
- The LFA aims to link individual activities with longer-term impact and to show direct and indirect cause and effect
- Using the same kind of approach and the same terms makes it easier to:
  - locate development service within the wider development framework
  - discuss the longer-term contribution of development service with partners and donors

The disadvantages of using the LFA are that:

- It uses jargon and is not immediately user-friendly.
- It is not possible to neatly encapsulate the whole of human experience into boxes.
- It assumes that all project contingencies can be foreseen from the start, and that there will be a predictable, linear, logical progression from activities to outputs to purpose to goal.
- It can lead to a rigidly controlled project design that becomes disconnected with field realities and changing situations.
- Very few logical frameworks are done with beneficiaries. They are often done on behalf of communities.

However, if done well, LFA can be successfully used at the grassroots level by partners, development workers, community leaders and civil society organisations in participatory workshops to develop a shared vision for implementing agreed plans. Many of the tools and methods included in this handbook can be adapted to facilitate a more participatory process for LFA.

Although the logical framework includes several levels up to impact, this methodology is NOT intended to measure the impact of development service. This would be inappropriate, as in general the work of development workers is not enough to generate impact on its own. Rather, we look at how development service contributes to short and long-term development goals.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reached goals (IMPACT)</td>
<td>Long term impacts, to which changes (outcomes) contribute, but which cannot really be controlled</td>
<td>Contribution in structural changes at system level or institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contribution to national objectives of development (health service coverage, education level, mortality rates, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical changes (OUTCOME)</td>
<td>Practical changes at the level of beneficiaries and organisations, or environment, caused by activities of development worker/project in partnership with others</td>
<td>Changes in people's lives, e.g. economic, cultural, spiritual, personal, social, psychological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Changes in attitudes, ideas, awareness, behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Development of autonomy and raised awareness of own strengths (empowerment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reinforced organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation of improved services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increasing of awareness level (awareness raised)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete and direct results (OUTPUT)</td>
<td>Concrete and direct results of what volunteers do (product of their activities)</td>
<td>No. of trained persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No. of established systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No. of participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No. of constructed schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amount of published material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development workers' ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>What development workers do</td>
<td>Capacity building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Technical advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Networking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: Result 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, and feedback. In some agencies, research is part of the results chain.

Projects and programmes are based on plausible impact hypotheses describing the linkages between outputs, outcomes and impacts at specific as well as systems level. The evidence of outcome/impact is often multidimensional and determined by many factors, hence attribution is an ambitious endeavour.
Appendix 4: Outcome Mapping Approach and Methodology

Outcome Mapping (OM) focuses on one particular category of results: changes in the behaviour of people, groups, and organisations with whom a programme works directly. These changes are called "outcomes". Through the OM method, development programmes can claim contributions to the achievement of outcomes rather than claiming the achievement (attribution) of development impacts. OM helps to analyse complex changes, especially those relating to behaviour and knowledge. The underlying principles are that (1) changes are complex and do not move in a linear way, (2) development is done by and for people, and finally (3) although a programme can influence the achievement of outcomes, it cannot control them because ultimate responsibility rests with the people affected.

### Outcome Mapping Framework

**The vision** reflects the broad human, social & environmental betterment in which the programme is engaged and to which it is contributing.

**The mission statement** describes in a broad way the contribution of the donor programme to the vision. It describes how the programme intends to operationalise its role in support of the vision and support the achievement of outcomes by its partners, and how it will remain effective, efficient, relevant and sustainable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Challenge: Boundary Partner A</th>
<th>Outcome Challenge: Boundary Partner B</th>
<th>Outcome Challenge: Boundary Partner C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The outcome challenges describe the changed behaviours (relationships, activities, and/or actions) of a partner; and how they would be behaving if they were contributing ideally to the vision.</td>
<td>Set of progress markers</td>
<td>Set of progress markers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set of progress markers: progress Markers are a gradual set of statements (milestones) describing a progression of changed behaviour in a partner. They describe changes in actions, activities &amp; relationships leading up to the ideal outcome challenge statement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Support strategies from the programme / project:** The strategies outline the approaches of the project team in working with the partners. They indicate the relative influence the programme is likely to have on a project partner. An overview of the strategies helps to pinpoint strategic gaps in the approach or determine whether the programme is over-extended; it also suggest the type of evaluation method appropriate to track and assess the performance of the project.

**Organisational practices** describe the efforts of the project team in order to remain innovative, effective and relevant for the programme purpose.
The Logic Model of Outcome Mapping
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Appendix 5: Theory of Change

A Theory of Change describes how the partners think that their project will bring about the desired results. On a “pathway of change” (Outcomes Framework) it depicts the causal logic of the entire project and each particular intervention. In the planning process, they do a “backwards mapping” starting with the agreed upon long-term goal. In a second step the participants identify the conditions in terms of outcomes that must be given or created to meet this goal(s). Then they define the pre-conditions and the pre-pre-conditions etc. in the sense of cause-effect relationships. Essential elements of the pathway of change are the assumptions about the change process. Assumptions can be external factors that must hold true as well as rationale for specific causal links. When all important assumptions are made explicit, we get a robust “outcome framework”. A Theory of Change uses detailed performance indicators with four components: Population (who/what to reach), target (how many), threshold (to what extent) and timeline (by when).
Appendix 6: Outputs, Outcomes, Impacts – What do we hope to see?

Examples of concrete and direct results (outputs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humans capacities</td>
<td>No. of persons educated in nursing, sewing, carpentry, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems</td>
<td>No. of established drinking water systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge, information</td>
<td>No. of people that know the relationship between hygiene and health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>No. of school built, hospital built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material, documents</td>
<td>Amount of published didactic material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness, engagement</td>
<td>No. of people that understand the importance of safe deliveries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples of changes (outcomes: mostly qualitative change)

These are actual changes/benefits brought about by development workers through working with different stakeholders. They reflect the development of self-reliance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualitative change at project/partner level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changes of attitudes, ideas, awareness, behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social, cultural, political, personal changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes at the level of individuals, groups, community organisations, institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes of habits, priorities, resources, systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in roles, relationships, responsibilities, in communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes at micro, meso or macro level, in specific sections or cross-sectorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Members/Civil Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local NGO’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International partner organ-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The public in-country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 7: Acronyms

ISC  International Steering Committee
NGO  Non-Governmental Organisation
MN   Mission am Nil International
MSC  Most Significant Change
PCM  Project/Programme Cycle Management
SWOT Strength, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats
UNV  United Nations Volunteers