APPENDIX 9

Criteria for Selection and testing IMTs

APPENDIX 9. Criteria for Selection and testing IMTs

	Factor	Donkey			D+Cart			Oxen			Oxcart			Hand cart			Wheel barrow			Bicycle			Bicycle Trailer			Ambulance- Bic			Bicycle Gears			Boats		
		I	K	KT	I	K	KT	I	K	KT	I	K	KT	I	K	KT	I	K	KT	I	K	KT	I	K	KT	I	K	KT	I	K	KT	I	K	KT
A	Condition of Road infrastructure Weather Terrain	+	+	+	+	*	+	+	*	+	+	*	+	+	*	+	+	+	+	+	*	+	+	*	+	+	*	+	–	–	–	–	–	+
B	Affordability Return to investments Running/ operating costs Return to investment Sharing/ collective ownership Hire	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	+	+	–	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	*	+
C	Security	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
D	Social/cultural/political factors	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
E	Durability Availability Animal welfare Availability of support services	Management to decide.																																
F	Type of load (Volume/weight) Nature of load (perish ability)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
G	Safety, Speed, Labour Operational characteristics (language, permits), Skills	Management to decide.																																
H	Versatility/flexibility (multi purposes)	+	–	–	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	–	–	+	+	+	+	+	+
I	Distances and range of operation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	–	–	+	+	+	+	+	+
J	Environmental issues	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
K	Ergonomics	Management to decide.																																

I= Iganga K= Kasese KT= Katakwi * Applicable in some areas of the district.

N.B Sledges were applicable only in Katakwi district.

APPENDIX 10

Developing a Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation Framework, by Mr D Smith, NRI

APPENDIX 10

Developing a Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation Framework, by Mr D Smith, NRI

Context and Aims

The project's mid-term review recommended that the project team should ensure that a participatory monitoring and evaluation framework is developed during the Golden Milestone Workshop (2-4th July, 2003), and that the framework is reflected in adjustments to the project's logical framework (Communication from DFID CPHP East Africa Office, May 2003).

Due to the number of issues that needed to be covered during the three-day Golden Milestone Workshop (documented in-part through the Building Partnerships Memo), and the attendance of external stakeholders, it was felt that a separate two-day workshop should be convened the following week to address monitoring and evaluation amongst the project's coalition partners. Consequently, the workshop was convened, and took place on the 8-9th July, 2003, in the Sports View Hotel, Kampala. All of the coalition partners were represented.

The context for developing a participatory monitoring and evaluation (M&E) framework for the project reflects the need for information as a basis upon which lessons can be learned during and after the project cycle, and as a means to measure and account for performance during and after the project cycle. The emphasis placed on a participatory approach highlights the questions of who initiates and undertakes the process, and who learns and benefits from the findings. This implies a move away from so-called 'conventional' approaches to M&E, characterised by pre-determined, extractive processes run by project managers and/or outside experts, to one which engages all key stakeholders in the determination, implementation and utilisation of information.

The adoption of an innovation systems approach (see Building Partnerships Memo) by the project places further emphasis on a participatory and inclusive approach to monitoring and evaluation. Numerous individuals, groups and organisations have a stake in the project, in the sense that they stand to be affected by it and/or have an influence over its process and outcome. Thus, effective M&E needs to be based on a multi-level approach that recognises (and where possible, harmonizes) the different, often competing information needs of these various stakeholders[3].

To address these needs, the approach to monitoring and evaluation stressed the need for a strong and inclusive planning process, with clear aims, a road map of how they are to be reached, and a clear identification of those that have a stake in the project.

---

[3] It is important to stress that participatory M&E should not be interpreted as M&E only with and by end-users (as has been commonplace), which overlooks the key roles and responsibilities of other stakeholders in the design and implementation process.

This process was initiated during the Golden Milestone Workshop, and thus presented a platform for considering M&E needs.

The two-day workshop on monitoring and evaluation sought to achieve a number of aims: the identification of information needs by the coalition partners, the translation of these needs into measurable indicators, the determination of appropriate methods for information gathering, and the development of individually tailored partner action plans. These aims are outlined in the workshop programme (Annex 1.)

Process and Immediate Results

Introducing, Discussing and Clarifying the Concepts. The first workshop sessions aimed to take stock of existing knowledge and experience of Monitoring and Evaluation, and of Participation. Each participant noted down on cards their understanding of the terms Monitoring and Evaluation, and these were posted up, grouped and discussed. The ensuing discussion revealed a good understanding of the terms by all participants, outlining the differences between monitoring and evaluation, separating the accountability from learning functions, identifying the questions of what information is needed, by whom and how collected, and raising concerns over capacity.

A similar exercise was conducted to discuss the term participation, with the responses grouped and reviewed. A typology of participation was used as a framework for analysing the responses (Pretty et al, 1995:61[4]), and discussions centred around the level and nature of participation that should be expected in monitoring and evaluating the project.

The two sets of terms, participation and M&E, were brought together to discuss what Participatory M&E (or PM&E) actually means, how it may differ from more conventional approaches to M&E, and why it may be applied (discussion material can be found in Annex 2.). Views varied, with some consensus over the need for differing levels of participation for different activities; namely, more engaged participation (somewhere between functional and interactive participation in the framework) being required in the regular monitoring, with perhaps a need for less participation (somewhere between participation in information giving and participation by consultation) in periodic or final evaluation.

Having discussed and clarified the meaning and possible value of varying levels of participation within monitoring and evaluation, two further terms were introduced: performance and impact. *Performance* was defined as 'the functioning of the project over which the partners involved have direct control or a manageable interest'. *Impact* was defined as 'the sustainable change of a particular initiative attributable to specific actions in and among different stakeholder environments'.

The terms were used to clarify different levels of attribution and timing in M&E activities, concluding that the project and its partners would require both performance

[4] Pretty, Jules N, et al (1995) Participatory Learning and Action - A Trainer's Guide, IIED, London.

information (telling the project partners how well they are doing as they are doing it), and impact information (telling the project partners and other stakeholders the extent to which they are achieving/ have achieved the project's aims and what that actually means).

Reviewing Roles and Activities. Through discussion, it was felt that there had not been sufficient time available during the Golden Milestone Workshop to reflect on the role statements and associated activities generated by each of the coalition partners. As clarity of implementation roles and responsibilities are prerequisites to developing M&E plans, some time was spent reflecting on this earlier work. Each partner considered its own role statements and activities, and those of the other members of the partnership. Some revisions were made and discussed (see Building Partnerships Memo, Annex 4.)

Determining Information Needs. To begin the process of constructing an M&E framework for the project, each of the partners were asked to write down what information they felt would be needed to tell them how they were doing in their day-to-day activities, and in terms of understanding their accomplishments. Using their role statements, and their activity lists, the partners were presented with the following guidance:

Why might we need information?
to determine how well we are accomplishing our activities in view of our role.
to see how the achievement of our role contributes to the achievement of the aims
to assess the extent of achievement of the aims

How do we decide upon the types of information we might need?

Ask yourself:
What information could be used to demonstrate how successful we are being in achieving a particular activity in contribution to our role(s)?
What would we point to if we were asked how we were doing in achieving a particular activity?

Further guidance was provided to assist in the generation of indicator type information statements (see Annex 3. for details).

The extensive responses from each partner were posted on a wall, grouped according to their specific roles and activities. Time was spent reflecting on the variety of types of information outlined, and whether or not the questions posed were being suitably answered.

Developing Frameworks. The process of reviewing and piecing together information was an iterative one, and was used to guide the framework development. With the concepts of performance and impact as a backdrop, three separate, although linked, frameworks emerged from the information;

Performance Monitoring Framework: to track the progress and performance of day-to-day activities as a basis for learning and corrective action

Impact Monitoring Framework: to track progress towards the roles of each partner, and be able to say something about changes occurring as a consequence of the interventions as a basis for learning

Impact Assessment Framework: to review the extent of achievement of the roles by each partner, their contribution to the aims of the project and the achievements of the project as a whole as a basis for learning and accountability.

These frameworks emerged out of reflecting upon, and grouping of. the different types of information: what collection of this information might be used for, who will collect it, who will use it and how it may be used. Where types of information were felt to be addressing similar activities or impact issues, the information was standardised. Following this grouping and standardisation process, the information texts were translated into more measurable indicators. This not only helped question and clarify what the information might be used for and by whom, but also posed the question of whether or not it was collectable (dealt with in the next section).

The indicators outlined fell broadly into two types: those measuring the quantity of achievement, and those measuring the quality of achievement. For example, the number of training events conducted, and the satisfaction with the training events conducted as perceived by key stakeholders.

The grouping of indicators for performance monitoring was centered around the different phases of implementation: resource flows, sensitisation and training processes, utilisation and feedback. A separate set of indicators was outlined for measuring the level and quality of interaction amongst the partners. These partnership indicators were established at a generic level, and it was agreed that having reviewed and agreed the modalities of specific partner-partner and partner-stakeholder links (see Building Partnership Memo: Action Points), these indicators would be made more specific and relevant. All of this information was felt to be vital on a regular basis to guide performance.

The impact monitoring indicators focused more closely on the technical aspects of IMT performance, and the satisfaction of the users. This information was felt to be useful on a periodic basis, to guide progress and process.

The impact assessment indicators identified during the workshop were few in number, and it was expected that more would be generated prior to, and during the follow-up partnership meeting. It was also noted that some of the indicators listed for 'impact monitoring' may not be collectable on a periodic basis (due to time or cost restrictions), and thus moved to the impact assessment framework. Two key areas were identified for impact assessment: cost effectiveness, and attitudinal change amongst users.

The frameworks are outlined in Annex 4.

Outlining possible methodologies. Having identified the types of information that needs to be collected to review the project and partners' performance and impact, the next step was to determine how this information should be gathered. The process for identifying appropriate methods was based on a review of each of the indicators outlined in the three frameworks in the context of instruments already being used or known about.

The types of instruments outlined reflect the nature of the indicators being measured, the purpose of measurement, and who is responsible for it. In some cases, specific instruments were suggested (e.g. delivery notes and payment receipts to assess the purchase and distribution process), in other cases, more generic tools were outlined which could be adapted to suit each specific need (for example. planning and checking forms for counting the completion of activities). For assessing the quality of particular activities, a quality assessment questionnaire was outlined (Annex 5).

Whilst checklists and questionnaires were felt to be potentially useful for the measurement of certain indicators by certain partners, it was also recognised that client or end-user assessment of performance and impact may require different tools. In the absence of strong client representation at the workshop, it was suggested that each of the intermediary partners present that have a mandate to work directly with different client groups would need to develop appropriate strategies in situ. This would include developing role and activities plans with each client group, followed by identifying M&E needs including appropriate methodologies. A number of different participatory tools were briefly outlined which may be used with clients by intermediary partners to assess the nature, quality and attribution of change as a consequence of project activities.

Due to the incomplete status of the frameworks (including the lack of representation of client groups), and slippage during the workshop, this exercise was not completed. It was suggested that due to the breadth and detail of discussions during the workshop, and the prior sessions held during the Golden Milestone workshop, some time could be usefully spent by all participants reflecting on the planning processes, and filling in the gaps where appropriate. Thus, an action point was drafted for all participants to spend time between the end of workshop and the next partnership meeting reviewing what has been discussed, and considering possible methods where they have not already been identified.

Conclusions and Proposed Actions

The aims of the workshop were partially completed. The concept of participatory monitoring and evaluation was discussed and clarified, the information needs of the coalition partners were identified and translated into measurable indicators, and a number of methods for gathering this information were outlined. Three frameworks were designed which present the basis upon which the details can be fleshed out, enabling the assessment of the performance and impact of the project. However, insufficient time was available to outline a full range of indicators, methodological options, or the development of specific action plans for each partner to take away.

An informal feedback process conducted at the end of the workshop suggested that it had been a useful exercise, resulting in an improved understanding of the role and function of participatory monitoring and evaluation, and the initiation of a process through which the project partners can assess change. The frameworks developed helped focus the partners' attention of what needs to be done by whom, and for what purpose.

A series of generic action points (Annex 5) were outlined as a basis for carrying the process forward between the end of workshop and the next partnership meeting. These points should be viewed in conjunction with originating from the Partnership Building work (see Memo), as more work is required on understanding and operationalising the intra-partnership and partnership-external stakeholders links as a basis for refining certain indicators and instruments.

The action points are as follows:

1. Performance and Impact Frameworks

Review the three frameworks: Performance Monitoring (the regular collection of information to tell you and others how well you are doing in your activities); Impact Monitoring (the periodic collection of information which tells you and others how well you are doing in achieving your role and the project's aims); Impact Assessment (the final collection of information to assess the effect of the project against its aims)

Make notes on the indicators- suggesting changes or refinements where you think necessary

List where you feel that specific performance and impact monitoring issues are your responsibility and consider how, and how often you feel you may be able to carry out these activities

Where you are responsible for refining a method for information collection (NB. Transport Forum Group, Design Centre) – do so.

Refinement of the logical framework based on the indicators outlined in the three performance categories and impact frameworks, and fleshed out by the partners (point b. above).

2. Implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation Training with Clients

A number of intermediaries are responsible for working with their clients to facilitate the development of client action and M&E plans

For implementation action plans, intermediaries should outline the purpose of the project with clients, and facilitate the development of client roles and activities and timescales. As a guide, look at the role and activities outlined by the Iganga farmers during the Golden Milestone workshop

This should be followed by facilitating the determination of information needs of these clients as per the Performance Monitoring and Impact Frameworks.

If possible, methods should be developed with the clients to collect this information, and timescales set as to when this data should be collected

The result of these facilitatory activities between intermediaries and clients should be implementation action plans, and associated M&E plans.

By when?

The review activities (action points under Section 33 (1) should be completed by the next project partnership meeting.

The implementation and M&E training should have been started by the next project partnership meeting.

The logical framework should be revised during the next project partnership meeting.

DEVELOPING PRACTICES IN PARTICIPATORY MONITORING AND EVALUATION

Convened on: JULY 8th-9th, 2003 by: David Rider Smith

DAY 1 AIMS:
Introduction to Participatory M&E
Determining M&E information needs

Introduction – outlining Day 1 and Day 2 aims, determining needs	09:00-09:30
Defining M&E and Participation	09:30-10:30
Elements of participatory M&E	10:30-11:00
Break	*11:00-11:30*
PM&E Planning Exercise – part 1: Reviewing roles and activities	11:30-12:30
PM&E Planning Exercise – part 2: Determining own information needs	12:30-13:00
Lunch	13:00-14:00
PM&E Planning Exercise – part 2 (continued) Turning information needs into assessable indicators	14:00-15:30
Break	*15:30-16:00*
Day Review	16:00-16:45

DAY 2 AIMS:
Clarifying performance and impact indicators
Determining appropriate methods for information gathering
Drawing up action plans

Summary of Day 1, Outline of Day 2	09:00:09:30
PM&E Planning Exercise – part 3 Testing performance and impact indicators	09:30-10:00
PM&E Planning Exercise – part 4 Outlining possible methods for information gathering	10:00-11:00
Break	*11:00-11:30*
PM&E Planning Exercise – part 4 (continued) Determining appropriate methods for information gathering	11:30-13:00
Lunch	*13:00-14:00*
Action Plan Development Roles, activities, indicators, methods, timescale, responsibility	14:00-15:00
Reviewing the System Fitting the action plans together	15:00-15:30
Break	*15:30-16:00*
Reviewing the System (continued)	16:00-16:30
Workshop Review	16:30-17:00

Annex 2. Discussion notes on clarifying Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation

	Conventional	Participatory
Who does it?	External Experts	All key stakeholders
What is it based on?	Predetermined indicators of success, mainly associated with costs and the production of outputs	Stakeholders identify their own indicators of performance and success (which may include outputs, but will be broader)
How?	Focused on 'scientific objectivity', distancing those doing the M&E from other participants, often using complex procedures, with a delay to the presentation of results	Emphasises 'self-evaluation' – simple methods adapted to each stakeholders circumstances, open, immediate sharing of results through involvement
When?	Periodic monitoring, mid-term and final evaluations	More continuous (monthly), smaller-scale
Why?	To account for money spent on the basis of outputs delivered.	To learning lessons to improve performance, to empower stakeholders to take control, and to account for money spent

Growing dissatisfaction with conventional monitoring and evaluation approaches, for the following reasons:
They are expensive, and often ineffective in terms of measuring and assessing project achievements
They have failed to actively involve project beneficiaries and other stakeholders who may be involved or directly affected by monitoring and evaluation
They have become an increasingly specialised field and activity, conducted and controlled mostly by outsiders and removed from the ongoing planning and implementation of development initiatives
They serve primarily as a tool to control and manage projects and resources, alienating intended beneficiaries and others involved in project planning and implementation from taking part in project appraisal
They emphasise quantitative measures ("facts") and tend to ignore qualitative ("truth") information which provides a fuller understanding of process and change.

In response, the involvement of 'participation' in development thinking has provided new ways of approaching monitoring and evaluation, being more responsive to people's needs and real-life contexts. The arguments for participatory M&E are as follows:
Enhanced participation, especially of beneficiaries, in M&E helps improve understanding of the development process itself
Increased authenticity of M&E findings which are locally relevant
Improving the sustainability of project activities, by identifying strengths and weaknesses for better project management and decision making

Increasing local level capacity in M&E, which in turn contributes to self-reliance in overall project implementation
Sharing of experience through systematic documentation and analysis based on broad-based participation
Accountability to donors: to report to funding agencies the extent to which efforts are meeting intended objectives
More efficient allocation of resources: PM&E findings help determine how limited resources could be used more effectively

Summary of the key features of PM&E:

PM&E should seek to give voice to local needs, priorities, aspirations and resources
PM&E tools are not ends in themselves, but a vehicle for stakeholder discussion, analysis, problem solving and action
PM&E builds on the participatory creation of expected results or changes
PM&E is not a one-off exercise, but a process that is ongoing reflecting the actions of a project
PM&E should emphasise a positive approach to learning and improving performance, recognising commitment, innovation and flexibility rather than judgement or punishment
PM&E should emphasise action taken to achieve meaningful change rather than simply collecting information.

Annex 3. Turning Information into Measurable Indicators - guidance

Each information statement was reviewed in light of the following characteristics:

An indicator should:

Track actual change. Measures progress towards achievement, both in terms of quantity (e.g. the number of training sessions held) and the quality (e.g. levels of participation in these training sessions)
Be controllable by your actions. The information gathered should relate specifically to things that you are doing (e.g. providing funds to another stakeholder) rather than to more general objectives that are outside of your control
Be objective. There should be general agreement over what the information is being gathered for and what type of results you might expect.
Be practical. The information should be obtainable without too much time or financial cost
Be Reliable. The information gathered should be of sufficiently reliable quality to enable it to be used confidently, i.e. that it provides a basis for making decisions.

Annex 4. The Three Frameworks

PERFORMANCE MONITORING FRAMEWORK – IMT PROJECT – DRAFT 08/07/03

Indicator for Information Collection	Who will collect it?	How will it be collected?	How often will it be collected?	Who will use it?	How will it be used?
Production and Resource flow process					
Efficiency and effectiveness of the flow of financial and other resources between partners	All partners?	To be determined	*To be determined*	All partners	To assess efficiency and effectiveness as a basis for learning from problems to improve the process
Efficiency and effectiveness of the purchase and distribution process	Various (name)	Delivery Notes Payment Receipts	As and when purchase and distribution occurs	Receivers of the IMTs – intermediaries and clients Distributions of the IMTs	To assess efficiency and effectiveness as a basis for learning from problems to improve the process
Number of IMT's manufactured against targets	Manufacturers	Planning and Checking Form	Planning – tri-monthly? Checking – as per production levels	Producers, Clients, Intermediaries	To assess supply against demand
Sensitisation and training process					
Number of sensitisation events conducted	Intermediaries (name)	Planning and Checking Form	Planning – monthly? Checking – as per events	Intermediaries And to share with other partners during tri-monthly meetings as the basis for progress reports	To provide a check on the progress of event-based activities

Indicator for Information Collection	Who will collect it?	How will it be collected?	How often will it be collected?	Who will use it?	How will it be used?
Quality of sensitisation events conducted	Intermediaries (name)	To be determined	To be determined	Intermediaries And to share with other partners during tri-monthly meetings as the basis for progress reports	To provide evidence on satisfaction with events as a basis for learning and corrective action
	Clients	*To be determined by clients*	*To be determined by clients*	Clients	*To be determined by clients if necessary*
Number of training events	Intermediaries (name)	Planning and Checking Form	Planning – monthly? Checking – as per events	Intermediaries And to share with other partners during tri-monthly meetings as the basis for progress reports	To provide a check on the progress of event-based activities
Quality of training events	Intermediaries (name)	Quality Assessment Tool	After each event	Intermediaries And to share with other partners during tri-monthly meetings as the basis for progress reports	To provide evidence on satisfaction with events as a basis for learning and corrective action
	Clients	*To be determined by clients*	*To be determined by clients*	Clients	*To be determined by clients if necessary*

Indicator for Information Collection	Who will collect it?	How will it be collected?	How often will it be collected?	Who will use it?	How will it be used?
Utilisation and feedback process					
Level of use of IMTs	Clients	IMT Utilisation Form? *Possible use of Alan's – Design Centre*	Daily	Clients and intermediaries	To provide a basis for assessing whether or not the IMTs are being over- or under-utilised
Level of affordability Ability to agree on cost sharing Ability to pay on time (credit) Level of further demand	Intermediaries	To be determined	To be determined	Clients and intermediaries	To know the extent to which full ownership is likely, and provide a basis for estimating sustainability and future demand
	Clients	*To be determined by clients*	*To be determined by clients*	Clients	*To be determined by clients if necessary*
Demand Assessment process					
Levels of repeat and new demand for IMTs	Intermediaries	*To be determined*	*To be determined*	Intermediaries	To enable follow-up, new purchases, etc and as an indication of the existing and future sustainability of the initiative.

Indicator for Information Collection	**Who will collect it?**	**How will it be collected?**	**How often will it be collected?**	**Who will use it?**	**How will it be used?**
Partnership process					
Levels of collaboration between key partners	Partners involved	Available media (telephone, fax, tri-monthly meetings)	As and when	Partners involved	To assess the utility of the relationships over implementation and dissemination issues as a basis for learning and corrective action
Effectiveness of collaboration between key partners	Partners involved	To be determined	Tri-monthly?	Partners involved	
Levels of collaboration between clients and partners	Clients	*To be determined by clients*	*To be determined by clients*	Clients	*To be determined by clients if necessary*
Effectiveness of collaboration between clients and partners	Clients	*To be determined by clients*	*To be determined by clients*	Clients	*To be determined by clients if necessary*
Levels of collaboration between partners and external stakeholders	Partners involved	Available media (telephone, fax, tri-monthly meetings)	As and when	Partners involved	To assess the utility of the relationships over implementation and dissemination issues as a basis for learning and corrective action
Effectiveness of collaboration between partners and external stakeholders	Partners involved	To be determined	Tri-monthly?	Partners involved	

IMPACT MONITORING FRAMEWORK – IMT PROJECT – DRAFT 08/07/03

Indicator for Information Collection	Who will collect it?	How will it be collected?	How often will it be collected?	Who will use it?	How will it be used?
Context of IMT use: changes in terrain/ climate changes in infrastructure changes in security situation	Intermediaries	Observation and key informant discussion	Two-monthly?	Intermediaries, clients, knowledge providers	Learning: to assess context as a basis for adapting service delivery
How IMTs are being used* Types and weights of load Length of journey Sole operator/ hire/ group Number of journeys Cost?	Intermediaries	Semi-structured checklist?	Two-monthly?	Intermediaries, clients, knowledge providers	Learning: to assess utilisation as a basis for improved service delivery Accountability: To assess performance against roles and project aims
Satisfaction of IMT users	Intermediaries	*To be determined*	Two-monthly?	Intermediaries, clients, knowledge providers	Learning: to assess context as a basis for adapting service delivery Accountability: To assess performance against roles and project aims
	Clients	Impact flow charts?	Two-monthly?	Clients, Intermediaries	To provide evidence of satisfaction and change
Maintenance/ Repair* Cost Frequency	Intermediaries	Semi-structured checklist?	Two-monthly?	SOCADIDO, TRAP, GIAT, MTCEA, FABIO	Training

Nature Capacity to do it				Design Centre, TRAP, FABIO	Re-design

*NB. Durability will be calculated on the basis of information gathered on use and maintenance

IMPACT ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK – IMT PROJECT – DRAFT 08/07/03

Indicator for Information Collection	Who will collect it?	How will it be collected?	How often will it be collected?	Who will use it?	How will it be used?
Cost-effectiveness	Based on information available through impact monitoring		Calculated at end of project if not before	Clients Intermediaries Knowledge Providers External Stakeholders	To assess the performance of the project, and the basis for scaling up/ disseminating certain cost-effective IMTs
Attitudinal Change	Intermediaries	*To be determined*	*End of Project*	Clients Intermediaries Knowledge Providers External Stakeholders	To assess the performance of the project, and the basis for sharing lessons through dissemination

*NB: it is expected that more impact assessment indicators will be developed, and/or that certain impact monitoring indicators may not be feasibly assessed during the life of the project, and may therefore be moved to the end of project assessment.

Annex 5. Sample of the Methodological Tools outlined

Planning and Checking Form

Activity:			
Detail	Expected	Actual	Explanation
Topic(s):			
Location:			
Target audience: Number/ Composition			
Responsible Person(s) for activity			
Start/ End date			
Cost			

Quality Assessment Tool

Activity (or group of):					
Statement	Assessment (tick the box)				Evidence
1. I understood the purpose of what we were doing	*1 Completely*	*2 Kind of*	*3 Not really*	*4 Not at all*	
2. I understood the content of what we did	*1 Completely*	*2 Kind of*	*3 Not really*	*4 Not at all*	
3. I found what we did useful	*1 Completely*	*2 Kind of*	*3 Not really*	*4 Not at all*	
4. I will use what we did in the future to help me	*1 Completely*	*2 Kind of*	*3 Not really*	*4 Not at all*	
5. I found the person(s) conducting the work helpful	*1 Completely*	*2 Kind of*	*3 Not really*	*4 Not at all*	
6. I felt able to ask the person(s) questions about the work we did	*1 Completely*	*2 Kind of*	*3 Not really*	*4 Not at all*	

~~Annex 6: Improved Food Crops Marketing Through Appropriate Transport For~~ Poor Farmers In Uganda

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION JULY – SEPTEMBER 2003

At the end of the Training Workshop on Participatory Monitoring & Evaluation held 7-9 July 2003 at the Sports View Hotel Kireka. the Project Partners agreed on the following Way Forward:

No.	Activity	Time Frame	Responsibility
	Intermediaries to make budgets for their Action Plan for July-September 03 and submit to TFG for necessary action	By Last Week July 03	Intermediaries, TFG and NRI
	Meet Clients to negotiate their role and our role in the project	By First Week August 03	Intermediaries, Clients
	Assessment of effective demand for IMTs taking into consideration the beneficiary selection criteria agreed on at the Iganga Golden Milestone Workshop	By First Week August 03	Intermediaries, Clients. TFG and NRI
	Purchase and Distribution of IMTs	By Last Week August 03	TFG, NRI, Intermediaries, Suppliers, Manufacturers, Clients
	Train Clients in the use and maintenance of IMTs	By Second Week September 03	Intermediaries, Clients, TFG and NRI
	Make quarterly reports for consideration by the First Partnership Meeting 23-26 September 03	By Second Week September 03	Intermediaries, Clients, TFG, NRI
	Review Partnership with other stakeholders	On-going	Intermediaries, Clients, TFG, NRI, other Stakeholders
	First Quarterly Partnership Meeting to be held 23-26 September at the Catholic Social Center, Kasese	23-26 September 03	TFG, Intermediaries, Farmers, Suppliers, Manufacturers, etc.

Annex 7: Flow Analysis

Aim: to illustrate causal flows, impacts and linkages with clients.

Process: Start with one of the outcomes identified through the previous exercise: e.g. increased use of transport type X. Draw that in a box in the middle on a piece of paper. Then ask those present to say what effect that has on different economic and social issues of the respondents. Follow the trains of thought of the respondents: e.g. more use of transport X – less time to spend in the gardens, less production etc.. and/or less time spent at home, domestic care becomes the responsibility of other children, and/or more time spent, greater amount of produce moved from gardens to home, home to market, greater value… etc.

Use: This type of impact information should be collected as early as possible, as a basis to guide the activities of the stakeholders, enabling changes to be made where necessary.