

## Participatory monitoring and evaluation (PM&E) process

The rationale and an outline methodology for project PM&E was set out for discussion in the document, *Participatory evaluation: Discussion of key issues and the way ahead?* I realise that this document may well have been difficult to follow and would have benefited from a face-to-face presentation and discussion – my apologies – but hope that it might yet feed into the process.

While Participatory M&E was not originally asserted to be a guiding principle in the logframe, two of the six project outputs do explicitly refer to participatory evaluation<sup>1</sup>, while against all outputs individuals and/or groups are associated with the respective activity sets, and it was of course anticipated that these same people would play a role in ensuring the realisation of the objectively verifiable indicators (OVIs). Ultimately of course the OVIs and MoVs in the logframe provide a mechanism for the CPHP to monitor the project - albeit we are invited to assess the progress for them in the quarterly reports - in the more conventional sense.

Most recently the CPHP (in West Africa – and perhaps elsewhere where projects are being led by in-country agencies?) has introduced a 'project inception report' which includes a **monitoring plan** itself based on two tables: the stakeholder monitoring table and monitoring framework for outputs and purpose (see Tables 1 and 2). In West Africa the project inception report format is being used this quarter in place of the regular quarterly report, so I wondered whether we might consider using or adopting their two tables? Beside the inherent sycophancy (which might well be worthwhile with the review coming up) the exercise of together completing the 'boxes' might be useful in extending / confirming ownership and tightening our understanding of how we (the project) demonstrate that the project activities are on course.

Before I get too wordy, I suggest you look at the two tables. Table 1, the partner monitoring table, is relatively simple and can be readily transposed from the PM. If however all active individuals from partner agencies were to fill in their role, it would provide a ready check as to any gaps in the process. Table 2, the PM&E framework builds on Table 1 and the logframe, but also builds in the basic components of monitoring set out in the earlier, appended document.

I appreciate that for those most familiar with and/or with wider responsibilities this exercise might seem to be duplicating much they will already feel familiar, but in a sense the strength of the process lies in clarifying what we all individually understand our roles to be with specific respect to monitoring and evaluation. If individuals engage in the process then we will improve our familiarity with the project plan, identify gaps in our mutual understandings, have an opportunity to upgrade the existing logframe, but more importantly, its on-going implementation. All of which can be expected to broaden and deepen ownership.

PM&E typically involves four stages: planning the framework for the PM&E process, and determining objectives and indicators; gathering data; analysing and using data by taking action; and, documenting, reporting and sharing information. As suggested in the discussion document, albeit the planning stage was undertaken in a collaborative mode the technical predominance and the CPHP history, will understandably have lead to selected indicators for the outputs emphasising the more mechanistic interpretation of timely, quantitative and qualitative. Reviewing the existing indicators, and considering whether there are not others

---

<sup>1</sup> **Output 6:** Project procedures **evaluated** throughout the project cycle, using participatory processes to capture different stakeholders' perspectives.

**Output 3:** User acceptability of diatomaceous earths in terms of efficacy, cost, application method, taste, cooking and brewing characteristics of DE treated stored grain **evaluated**.

which might additionally or more appropriately speak to the realisation of the outputs, and consolidating and/or clarify our individual responsibilities in monitoring the indicators, analysing progress against indicators and contributing to necessary action, and recording these processes, will help us deliver better outputs.

We might also take this opportunity to check if current indicators are sufficiently 'SMART' (specific, measurable, action-orientated, relevant, time-bound) or 'SPICED' (subjective, participatory, interpreted, communicable, empowering, disaggregated), to develop the activity set associated with this output (and output 3).

Your thoughts then are invited on whether we should use the two attached tables to clarify our monitoring plan? Ideally all might make a first stab at filling in their respective sections in both tables. I've had a stab at mine for Table 1, and am still thinking about entries for Table 2 – it's quite challenging, and will lead I'm sure to interesting exchanges.

NB Re the discussion document: I understand from Tanya that some discussion of this document took place in Tanzania amongst team members (and other partners?). While I understand that the document did not prove to be particularly useful in galvanising the team or generating suggestions to move the process ahead, any record or recollections of exchanges that took place at that time about the document's contents should be recorded to demonstrate process and facilitate learning.

**Table 1.** Partner monitoring table (order from website)

Project partners – by individual & agency?	Role	Specific monitoring responsibilities
Dr Brighton Mvumi Department of Soil Science and Agricultural Engineering, University of Zimbabwe		
Tanya Stathers Natural Resources Institute		
Mike Morris Natural Resources Institute	Social and institutional development inputs, including contributions to: 3. Planning of participatory trials in Zimbabwe and Tanzania. 4. Development of extension materials. 6. Participatory evaluation of project processes.	Give general steer to PM&E and other project-wide / institutional processes, and specific steer on output 6. Work in conjunction with others in optimising the farmer participatory evaluation process (e.g. ensure diverse farmers incorporated, farmers criteria not subjugated by project intervention) Work in conjunction with others to optimise the dissemination processes associated with output 4, and promotion generally.
Plant Health Services, Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security, Tanzania		
Post Harvest Management Services, Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security, Tanzania		
IPM project / Plant protection services, Shinyanga Region		

**Table 2.** PM&E Framework (sections relevant to this past year highlighted in red – I hope)

Objective	Objectively verifiable indicators	Information required	Data collection method & frequency	Person / agency responsible	How and when reported
<p><b>Purpose:</b> Development and promotion of strategies to increase the availability and quality of food for poor households thereby improving their food security.</p>	<p>By 2005, improved and sustainable on-farm pre-storage and storage systems validated for vulnerable maize, sorghum, millet and legume harvests of poor farmers.</p> <p>By 2003, uptake pathways established for appropriate grain protection strategies</p> <p>By 2005, new knowledge adopted by target institutions (briefing of senior managers; confirmation that research outputs are compatible with target institutions' programmes; successful monitoring and evaluation of research outputs capability demonstrated by selected target institutions).</p> <p>By 2005, end users in target countries aware of knowledge programme outputs.</p>				
<p><b>Output1:</b> Methods for the protection of grain using commercially-available DEs against damage by <i>P. truncatus</i> and other storage insects <b>optimised</b>.</p>	<p>First year on-farm field trials of DEs in 2/3 sites in Tanzania completed by June 2003.</p> <p>Second year on-farm field trials at same sites in Tanzania completed by June 2004.</p>				
<p><b>Output 2:</b> Several different African deposits of DEs <b>evaluated</b> against storage insect pests, and assessed for their potential use as grain protectants.</p>	<p>At least two samples of local DEs collected in both Tanzania and Zimbabwe by Nov 2002 (DE samples from other countries in the region will also be sourced and trialled during the project).</p> <p>Laboratory efficacy trials (using standardised test protocol) of local DEs completed at University of Zimbabwe, NRI and Plant Protection Division and Diatom, by Oct 2003.</p>				

	<p>Crystalline silica content analysis of any promising local DEs completed by March 2004.</p> <p>Most promising DEs included in on-farm field trials in Tanzania and Zimbabwe from June 2004 - March 2005.</p> <p>Preliminary assessment of potential for exploitation and possible environmental impact of most promising local DE sources completed by Sept 2004.</p>				
<p><b>Output 3:</b> User acceptability of diatomaceous earths in terms of efficacy, cost, application method, taste, cooking and brewing characteristics of DE treated stored grain <b>evaluated</b>.</p>	<p>Temporary registration of DEs as grain protectants in Zimbabwe successfully completed by Apr 2003.</p> <p>Participatory trials evaluating user acceptance of DEs in terms of efficacy, cost, taste, cooking, brewing and application acceptability completed by May 2004 in Zimbabwe. Farmer managed trials of DEs as grain protectants in terms of efficacy, cost and application acceptability in Tanzania completed by Mar 2004 (first season) and Mar 2005 (second season). (Note: user perspective of DEs on taste, brewing etc can not be assessed until DEs are formally registered in Tanzania &amp; Zimbabwe.)</p> <p>Registration procedure of DEs as grain protectants by the TPRI in Arusha will be started in June 2002 and completed in September 2005.</p>				
<p><b>Output 4:</b> Extension materials describing DEs and their role and recommendations for use as a grain storage option by small-scale producers <b>developed</b> for the different information systems used by different groups</p>	<p>First draft of extension materials developed for the different information systems used by the different producer groups (women, non-literate etc.) including radio scripts, posters and leaflets (in Shona and Swahili) by Dec 2002.</p> <p>Pre-tested during the setting up of participatory trials (Jun-Aug 2003) with at least 50 potential DE users in</p>				

of producers.	<p>both Tanzania and Zimbabwe. Second draft field-tested with 25 potential DE users in both Tanzania and Zimbabwe by Feb 2004. Comments incorporated into final version by Apr 2004.</p> <p>40 extension officers and 10 NGO or CBO staff from semi-arid areas of Tanzania and Zimbabwe are satisfied with the grain storage management training workshop and understand the potential of DEs as one of a number of grain protectant strategies for small-scale producers by Mar 2005 in Zimbabwe and Tanzania.</p>				
<b>Output 5:</b>	<p>500 copies of written DE extension materials disseminated within both Tanzania and Zimbabwe by Feb 2005. 2 newsletter articles about the project findings submitted by December each year (2002-2005). At least one peer reviewed journal article submitted by May 2004.</p> <p>Individuals from 8 SADC countries are conversant with the projects findings and now have the capacity to include work on the use of DEs as an option for grain storage in their own countries in their workplans by Mar 2005.</p>				
<b>Output 6:</b> Project procedures <b>evaluated</b> throughout the project cycle, using participatory processes to capture different stakeholders' perspectives.	<p>The project is annually evaluated by all the different groups of stakeholders involved by March each year, and planned activities altered as necessary by May</p>	<p>Participatory completion of monitoring plan (Tables 1 &amp; 2). Reviewed against PM workplan.</p>	<p>E-mail; annually, but with a couple of iterations between all partners to ensure comprehensive airing of positions and unanimously agreed outcomes.</p>	<p>All individuals or partner agencies?</p>	<p>Final version to be circulated by project leader annually. Attached to CPHP Annual Report as supporting evidence.</p>
<b>Project processes:</b>					