A guide to assessing our contribution to **change**

ACT Development




ACT-Development Impact Project Working Group:

Jill Hawkey (ACT Development, Geneva)
Katharine Jones (Episcopal Relief and Development, USA)
Anita Kukreti (CASA, India)
Jayant Kumar (CASA, India)
Melton Luhanga (CARD, Malawi)
Maryssa Mapanao-Camaddo (LWF, Geneva)
Karen Nazaryan (WCC Roundtable of Armenia)
Alonso Roberts (CESE, Brazil)
Veronica Romero (Bread for the World, Germany)
Aidan Timlin (Christian Aid, UK and Ireland)
Wolfgang Zeese (Bread for the World, Germany)

Steering Group for the Guide:

Aidan Timlin, Alonso Roberts, Wolfgang Zeese

Guide drafted by:

FAKT Consult for Management, Training and Technologies GmbH
Gänsheidestrasse 43
D-70184 Stuttgart - Germany
Phone: +49 711 21095-0
Fax: +49 711 21095-55
Email: fakt@fakt-consult.de
Web: www.fakt-consult.de

FAKT Team:

Eberhard Gohl, Carsta Neuenroth, Alexandra Huber,
Verena Brenner

Contents

ACT Development:
A guide to assessing our contribution to change

Preface

The founding Assembly of ACT Development in February 2007 identified improving Impact Assessment as a priority initiative for the new alliance. This Guide is a key step towards fulfilling its vision for this initiative:

ACT Development participants have agreed principles and identified best practices and are using a common framework to assess, improve and communicate the impact of their work, thus deepening our and others' understanding of the differences we make as ACT participants in overcoming poverty and injustice, and enabling us to achieve more and better impact in the future.

The Impact Assessment initiative builds on an earlier ecumenical process that took place between 1996-99. This aimed to harmonise approaches to planning, monitoring and evaluation (PME) across ecumenical agencies and implementing partners, focusing on community-based projects. It resulted in a publication 'Building Bridges in PME: Guidelines for Good Practice in the Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation of Community-based Development Projects implemented by Southern NGOs with support from European Ecumenical Agencies' (ICCO, 2000). This was widely circulated among ecumenical organisations.

The current initiative recognises that the ACT Development (ACT-D) membership needs to:

- develop a common and deeper understanding of their contributions to poverty eradication and social justice, using relevant tools, skills and competencies to address the 'impact challenge';
- improve the effectiveness of their work and understand, through more systematic learning, how best to achieve their goals;
- be accountable and transparent to stakeholders, including beneficiaries[1], partners, churches, the public, regulators and donors;
- demonstrate their credibility, particularly when they come together, through developing and sharing common approaches and methods that enable them to better articulate the outcomes and impact of their work – individually and collectively.

---

1 *Beneficiaries is used in this Guide as convenient shorthand. Many organisations prefer alternative terms such as target population or primary stakeholders.*

Process followed in developing the Guide

In May 2007, the ACT-D Executive Committee set up the 'Impact Project' and formed a Working Group of representatives of eight participant and observer organisations to shape and steer the project.

The Working Group's first step was a survey of the ACT-D membership's current practice in assessing change and the challenges to be addressed. This revealed that while many organisations were using PME tools and doing some outcome evaluation, few were assessing and communicating long-term impact. The survey also highlighted that members were looking for support in identifying tools to strengthen their impact assessment.

Responding to this, the Working Group drafted a glossary of key terms for looking at change for consultation with members. A consultancy firm, FAKT, was commissioned to collect and summarise information about tools now in use within and beyond ACT-D. The resulting draft toolkit was tested and discussed at a global workshop involving representatives of a wider group of 20 ACT-D organisations in November 2008 in Stuttgart, Germany.

The Working Group also developed and tested a tool to enable ACT-D participants to self-appraise their organisational capabilities for outcome evaluation and impact assessment and to reflect on areas for improvement. This tool was tested at the workshop, and participants also drafted a list of 'Good Practices in Assessing Change'. All of these elements are now brought together in this first edition of the Guide.

The Impact Project is now entering a new phase of translating theory into practice, with member organisations and national forums undertaking self-appraisals, applying the tools, and developing case studies together. This Guide is therefore viewed as a 'work in progress' to be updated as feedback is received. The Working Group would welcome your comments, which can be sent to the ACT-D Secretariat (actdevelopment@wcc-coe.org).

1. Introduction

Why look at change?

All members of the ecumenical family, wherever we are located, share one common goal: to be good stewards of God-given resources and achieve positive, sustainable change in the lives of people oppressed by poverty and injustice.

ACT-D participants and observers have committed themselves to undertake high-quality work. As a new alliance, we have an opportunity to reflect rigorously on our own effectiveness, share our learning with others and provide clear evidence of our contribution to changes in the lives of those with whom we work.

This initiative also responds to the growing global debate about the effectiveness of development assistance. Questions persist about whether the North-South transfer of aid is leading to positive transformation in the lives of people.

The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, endorsed by government donors, partner countries and multi-lateral institutions in 2005, was one response to this debate. In this Declaration, signatories committed themselves to one common objective: to build stronger, more effective partnerships to enable partner countries to achieve their own development goals. Emerging from this debate was a challenge to civil society organisations to demonstrate their own effectiveness.

Approximately US$1.4 billion passes through the hands of ACT Development participants and observers each year. Are we, as an alliance, able to identify the difference these funds have made to the poorest and most vulnerable communities? Are we confident that our development efforts are effective in bringing about change? And can we demonstrate this?

While there is much evaluative activity within the alliance, most of this focuses on outcomes rather than longer-term changes. ‘Impact’ remains an elusive concept which few agencies have successfully pinned-down. This makes inter-organisational communication and shared learning around what difference we make a persistent challenge.

The membership of ACT-D has much to offer from its history, shared experience and global outreach. By bringing together the best of our impact assessment approaches, the alliance can establish itself as a proactive and visible player in development cooperation, bringing an ecumenical perspective to the understanding of change.

Our understanding of change

Our approach to looking at change draws on ACT-D's understanding of 'transformational development' that puts people's needs, rights and aspirations at the heart of development efforts. This includes[2]:

- Recognising people as central and primary actors in their own change;
- Affirming that all persons are created in the image of God with the right and potential to live just, humane and dignified lives in sustainable communities;
- Working tocreate conditions, structures and systems which promote dignity, justice, human rights and care for the environment;
- Recognising that this requires transformation at all levels and for all people: those with power, wealth and influence who control and use more than their share of resources and those most adversely affected by oppressive structures and systems;

Purpose of this Guide

The objective of this guide is twofold: to help organisations critically reflect on their capabilities for evaluating outcomes and assessing impact in their work, and to provide an overview of tools available.

The Guide encourages critical selection of a mix of complementary tools for collecting information about change. It promotes adoption of participatory and empowering approaches that include front line staff and intended beneficiaries.

2 *Adapted from Our Understanding of Development, ACT Development, May 2008.*

While the Guide is primarily concerned with the assessment of change, it is recognised that it is impossible to separate this from what needs to be done to ensure that change happens. Many of the tools listed are suitable for both planning and assessment and some are devised specifically for planning.

The Guide offers:

- A glossary of key terms relating to change and how we look at it.
- A Self-Appraisal Tool to help each ACT-D organisation to look at how it evaluates outcomes and assesses impact;
- Proposed good practices in assessing change;
- A categorisation of 24 tools with advice on steps towards selection;
- Suggested criteria for appraising the usefulness or appropriateness of a tool, with a rating to indicate strengths and weaknesses of each tool;
- A one-page summary of each tool, followed by the usefulness rating for that tool with, in some cases, comments by the authors or other experts.
- A bibliography and an annotated list of relevant websites.

Who is it for?

Senior managers: to support them in promoting deeper understandings of change and its assessment, both internally and externally, to help set policy direction and allocate resources for impact assessment.

Programme managers: to assist them in designing change assessment exercises and brief outside evaluators; and to support implementation and the use of results for internal learning to influence broader policy.

PME specialists: to promote more effective impact assessment by offering them readily-accessible tools and to assist them in deepening the understanding of change assessment throughout their organisations.

Evaluators: to expand their range of resources and communicate to them organisational expectations of change assessment.

2. Glossary of key terms relating to change and how we look at it

The sources cited in this guide apply various terms in various ways, reflecting the variety of language used across the sector to talk about change and its assessment. Indeed there is no consensus among organisations in ACT Development. However the Working Group has adopted the following working terms and definitions, hoping that they can be readily understood and will facilitate our communications. The definitions are consistent with those in the glossary of Building bridges in PME (ICCO, 2000) except that the Joint PME Project used the word effects for what are now generally known as outcomes.

<table>
<tr><th>Contributing to change [1]</th><th colspan="2">Assessing contributions to change [4]</th></tr>
<tr><td>Inputs: The resources (human, financial, technical and material) necessary to carry out project activities.[2]</td><td rowspan="3">Monitoring: Systematic and continuous assessment of the progress of the project in relation to its planned inputs, activities and outputs.</td><td rowspan="6">Indicators: Quantitative or qualitative evidence used to assess the extent to which intended changes are achieved.[5]</td></tr>
<tr><td>Activities: Actions or series of actions undertaken, using inputs, to produce planned outputs.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Outputs: Products or services, tangible or intangible, resulting directly from the implementation of activities.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Outcomes: Changes resulting from the use of outputs, during the project period or soon after, including unintended changes.</td><td>Evaluation: A systematic process to identify project outcomes, qualifying and/ or quantifying them, and to compare the outcomes to those intended in the project objective(s). Evaluation may be done continuously or periodically during the implementation of the project or specifically at its conclusion.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Impact: Lasting and significant changes in people's lives – including unintended changes, whether positive or negative – to which the project contributes, directly or indirectly.[3]</td><td>Impact assessment: Systematic identification and analysis of impact, including consideration of how well it fits the goal.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sustainability: The capability of maintaining through time the positive outcomes and impact obtained or of continuing the promotion of such changes in the future.</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

Notes:

(1) The heading "contributing to change" highlights the issue of **attribution** – becoming necessarily more tentative as we move from inputs to impact.

Inputs, **activities** and **outputs** are directly attributable. They are largely within the management control of those implementing a project, though not entirely: some of the inputs may depend on negotiation with other organisations, and outputs can also be affected by others (e.g. by participants in the target population).

For funding agencies, only inputs may be directly attributable, so their monitoring may have a more limited focus in such cases; though the same agencies may themselves be implementing other initiatives, for instance in advocacy, which are directly attributable to them.

Generally **outcomes** are less clearly attributable. The implementing organisation intends that the use of outputs should lead to the desired outcomes, as specified in the objective(s), but it cannot control what happens. Unexpected events may help or hinder. Risks may be mitigated if identified in advance, but they cannot be eliminated. Often one of the functions of evaluation is to consider whether and to what extent outcomes can be attributed to the project.

Impact is only indirectly attributable, with the complication of many other actors playing a part. Impact assessment always presents a double challenge: assessing what lasting and significant changes have occurred and assessing a particular organisation's contribution to these changes.

(2) The word **project** is to be understood broadly. No distinction is made here between project and programme since these terms are used differently by different organisations and in different contexts.

(3) A question arises about whether **institutional change** (strengthened organisation, increased participation, etc) should be considered to be impact. Normally such change is included among **outcomes** and it is often specified in project objectives, being seen as a crucial means to achieve **impact**. However, in some contexts institutional change is itself seen as impact, since people may feel more fulfilled and happier through being active in an organisation, even if that organisation, for a long time, makes little or no progress towards its goal (land reform or women's rights or whatever). Thus social activism can itself constitute a "lasting and significant change in people's lives" and is both a means and an end.

(4) Under the heading "assessing contributions to change", the glossary makes a clear distinction between **Monitoring** (of inputs, activities and outputs), **Evaluation** (of outcomes), and **Impact Assessment**; but this does not mean that the three must be kept separate.

Those involved in monitoring the implementation of a project should also take note of any outcomes already achieved, wholly or partly, and feed this information into the evaluation of the project. They should also be alert for signs of impact.

Similarly, those evaluating project outcomes should also register any evidence of impact, however fragmentary or anecdotal, whether of this project or, more generally, of the organisation's work in the same area or with the same population. Thus impact assessment should be cumulative, even if a specific, long-term study is realised at some point.

(5) Ideally, indicators should be **independent** and **verifiable**, and **precisely defined in terms of nature and timing**. In practice this is not always possible, but it is important to identify indicators even if they do not satisfy all the criteria.

(6) Various terms are used in relation to the means for planning, monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment – approach, method, framework, tool, etc. In this Guide, the word **tool** is meant in a general sense for any of those, being a way of accomplishing a task.

3. Organisational Self-Appraisal

Presentation

The Self-Appraisal Tool is designed to help each ACT-D organisation to look critically at its capability for assessing its contributions to change and for making use of the findings. It is intended to cover both outcome evaluation (OE) and impact assessment (IA) – a distinction made by most ACT-D organisations – in line with the Glossary definitions, above.

The Self-Appraisal Tool provides a framework for each organisation to:

» Identify its strengths and weaknesses in OE&IA
» Gain agreement on where the most important gaps lie
» Prioritise areas for improvement
» Direct its efforts in the development of OE&IA capability
» Register improvements in OE&IA capability over time, using the tool to provide a baseline for future appraisals (annual or biennial).

The tool assumes agreement on six essential principles for OE&IA that each organisation will aim to observe:

1. We manage for impact to maximise our potential contribution to change.
2. We look for evidence of outcomes to help us to account for and improve our work.
3. We look for evidence of impact to help us to understand our contribution to change and to account for and improve our work.
4. We are committed to following good practice in evaluation and impact assessment.
5. We apply information on outcomes and impact in our planning, decision-making and capacity development.
6. We communicate information on outcomes and impact to our stakeholders.

Principle 4 is related to the good practices in assessing change recommended in the next chapter. But each organisation should have its own statement of ‘standards’ or ‘good practices’ that may also include sector-specific indicators (for an organisation focusing on health or engaged mainly in advocacy, for example) or other particular points.

The six principles relate to an organisation as a whole. Where an organisation’s practice varies between different departments or programmes, it will have to need this into account in its self-appraisal and seek to ‘level up’.

Each principle comes with a number of indicators (such as policy, ways of working, reports, and training) involved in consistent observance of the principle.

Principles and the indicators involved in their observance

1. We manage for impact to maximise our potential contribution to change	2. We look for evidence of outcomes to help us to account for and improve our work	3. We look for evidence of impact to help us to understand our contribution to change and to account for and improve our work	4. We are committed to following good practice in evaluation and impact assessment	5. We apply information on outcomes and impact in our planning, decision-making and capacity development	6. We communicate information on outcomes and impact to our stakeholders
1.1 Expectations of impact are made clear in statements of organisational purpose and/or strategy	**2.1** Policy on evaluation is defined, specifying what type of evidence of outcomes the organisation seeks	**3.1** Policy on impact assessment is defined, specifying what type of evidence of impact the organisation seeks	**4.1** The organisation has a clear statement of standards for OE&IA to which it works	**5.1** Defined processes are in place at the appropriate level for managing the analysis and use of information on outcomes and/or impact	**6.1** Defined processes are in place governing the internal communication of information about outcomes and/or impact
1.2 Provision is made in organisational planning for setting expectations of impact, showing for whom impact is intended	**2.2** Processes for implementing evaluation policy are understood by all relevant staff	**3.2** Processes for implementing impact assessment are understood by all relevant staff	**4.2** The statement of standards for OE&IA is made known to all those involved in managing or conducting them	**5.2** Wherever possible, information on outcomes and/or impact is disaggregated by gender and by other issues of difference as appropriate (eg ethnicity, age)	**6.2** Defined processes are in place governing the external communication of information about outcomes and/or impact
1.3 Planning and budgeting decisions include consideration of the potential impact relative to the costs involved	**2.3** Budget is allocated to the evaluation of outcomes	**3.3** Budget is allocated to impact assessment	**4.3** OE&IA standards include a commitment to responding to the information needs of identified stakeholders – internal and external	**5.3** Information on outcomes and/or impact is regularly, synthesised where possible, for reporting at appropriate levels, eg by sector, region or country	**6.3** External communication of outcomes and/or impact addresses the information needs of beneficiaries and other stakeholders
1.4 The need for clarity about outcomes is built into project design (including precise definition of objectives)	**2.4** There is staff capacity for managing evaluation	**3.4** There is staff capacity for managing impact assessment	**4.4** OE&IA standards are consistent with ACT Development Good Practices in Assessing Change	**5.4** Unintended outcomes and impacts are identified, reported to appropriate levels of management and followed-up in a timely manner	**6.4** Internal and external communication about outcomes and/or impact is open about failures or shortcomings

1. We manage for impact to maximise our potential contribution to change	2. We look for evidence of outcomes to help us to account for and improve our work	3. We look for evidence of impact to help us to understand our contribution to change and to account for and improve our work	4. We are committed to following good practice in evaluation and impact assessment	5. We apply information on outcomes and impact in our planning, decision-making and capacity development	6. We communicate information on outcomes and impact to our stakeholders
1.5 Needs for information on impact are built into project design (eg baselines are set for impact assessment)	**2.5** There is staff capacity for conducting evaluation (with outside consultants, when needed)	**3.5** There is staff capacity for conducting impact assessment (with outside consultants, when needed)	**4.5** Terms of reference for internal and external evaluations and for impact assessment include the organisation's OE&IA standards	**5.5** The results of OE and/or IA are taken into account when project plans are reviewed and when new project or institutional plans are made	**6.5** Resources are allocated for distilling information about outcomes and/ or impact and communicating it to stakeholders
1.6 Monitoring systems allow for evidence of outcomes and impact to be captured	**2.6** Competencies are in place to enable information on outcomes to be analysed and reported, internally and externally	**3.6** Competencies are in place to enable information on impact to be analysed and reported internally and externally	**4.6** Provision is made for monitoring adherence to OE&IA standards	**5.6** Terms of reference for OE and/or IA make clear who is responsible for responding to the information obtained	**6.6** Partnership/ funding agreements include agreement on how and to whom information about outcomes and/or impact will be communicated
1.7 Management of interventions includes consideration of how best to sustain impact (eg through developing local capacity)	**2.7** Funding agreements make clear what outcome information is needed and how it may be used	**3.7** Funding agreements make clear what impact information is needed and how it may be used	**4.7** OE&IA standards include a commitment to learning from OE&IA experiences to improve OE&IA policy and practice	**5.7** Action is taken to strengthen outcomes/ impact and to address any areas of non-achievement	**6.7** Feedback from stakeholders about the accessibility and usefulness of outcome and impact information is fed into the planning of OE&IA exercises

1. We manage for impact to maximise our potential contribution to change	2. We look for evidence of outcomes to help us to account for and improve our work	3. We look for evidence of impact to help us to understand our contribution to change and to account for and improve our work	4. We are committed to following good practice in evaluation and impact assessment	5. We apply information on outcomes and impact in our planning, decision-making and capacity development	6. We communicate information on outcomes and impact to our stakeholders
	2.8 Evidence of outcomes is sought during project implementation, not just on or after completion	**3.8** Evidence of impact is sought during project implementation, as well as later		**5.8** Information from OE and/or IA is used as a learning tool in capacity development with staff and/or partners.	
	2.9 Terms of reference for evaluations explicitly distinguish outcome from impact information needs	**3.9** Terms of reference for impact assessments explicitly distinguish impact from outcome information needs			

Application

A self-appraisal for each indicator is registered on Sheet 1, with one page for each principle, using a 'RAG' (traffic light) code. One of three alternative scores is registered for each indicator, with supporting evidence cited in the final column:

- **Red** – the factor is absent
- **Amber** – the factor is present to some extent
- **Green** – the factor is systematically applied.

An honest, self-critical appraisal is sought, with reds and ambers positively encouraged. The process requires some discipline, since scores should be assigned on the basis of evidence rather than on a subjective judgement that the factor is 'felt' to be there. Supporting evidence might consist, for example, of the existence of OE&IA policy and procedures, or of provision in them for a particular factor, or of reports on past evaluations or impact assessments.

An overall self-appraisal for each principle may be registered on Sheet 2, again with a page for each principle, by ticking one of the alternatives:

- **Excellent capability** – all indicators for this principle are green
- **Good capability** – indicators are predominantly green
- **Some capability** – indicators are predominantly amber
- **Little or no capability** – indicators predominantly red.

Sheet 2 also has space for a brief narrative summarising the evidence, listing actions to be taken in relation to that principle, and identifying risks to maintaining or improving the rating over the following period.

Although the appraisal could be made by one person, it is recommended that a group should be entrusted with the task so as to provide a broader base for judgement and promote institutional commitment. At least half a day should be allowed to complete the self-appraisal.

While the Tool is designed for use as a self-managed exercise, some organisations may welcome outside facilitation to clarify the process and the types of evidence required. This support could be provided by a member of the Working Group or by a person from an ACT-D organisation in the same National Forum. A facilitated process – at least for the first self-appraisal – would enable the evidence needed for each indicator to be discussed and tested against the available information. The facilitator could confirm the initial appraisal as 'fair and appropriate'. This facilitation could serve to iron out any misunderstanding and could help develop some degree of consistency of appraisal across ACT-D or at least within each forum.

Although the self-appraisal is primarily intended for internal learning, the result should be shared with the ACT-D secretariat so that ACT-D can build up a picture of the alliance's OE&IA capabilities and can promote a culture of continuous improvement among the organisations, for instance by highlighting what improvements are possible and by sharing best practice.

Sheet 1:

RAG Self-appraisal

Principle 1: We manage for impact to maximise our potential contribution to change. [For each indicator, tick the green, amber or red column.]				
	Factor systematically present	**Factor present to some extent**	**Factor absent**	Supporting evidence
1.1 Expectations of impact are made clear in statements of organisational purpose and/or strategy.				
1.2 Provision is made in organisational planning for setting expectations of impact, showing for whom impact is intended.				
1.3 Planning and budgeting decisions include consideration of the potential impact relative to the costs involved.				
1.4 The need for clarity about outcomes is built into project design (including precise definition of objectives).				
1.5 Needs for information on impact are built into project design (eg baselines are set for impact assessment).				
1.6 Monitoring systems allow for evidence of outcomes and impact to be captured				
1.7 Management of interventions includes consideration of how best to sustain impact (eg through developing local capacity)				

Sheet 2:

Consolidated Appraisal

<table>
<tr><th colspan="3">Principle 1: We manage for impact to maximise our potential contribution to change</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Overall appraisal
(Tick one of the four)</td><td>Comments
(to feed into the Improvement Plan)</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="4">Definition: We manage our work in ways that keep us focused on the impact we want to achieve.

Indicators

1.1 Expectations of impact are made clear in statements of organisational purpose and/or strategy.

1.2 Provision is made in organisational planning for setting expectations of impact, showing for whom impact is intended.

1.3 Planning and budgeting decisions include consideration of the potential impact relative to the costs involved.

1.4 The need for clarity about outcomes is built into project design (including precise definition of objectives).

1.5 Needs for information on impact are built into project design (eg baselines are set for impact assessment).

1.6 Monitoring systems allow for evidence of outcomes and impact to be captured

1.7 Management of interventions includes consideration of how best to sustain impact (eg through developing local capacity)</td><td>1. Excellent capability
(all indicators are green)</td><td rowspan="4">Evidence: Summarise the evidence for the rating selected.

Steps to improve capability: Indicate actions already planned,with timescale, and possible future actions.

Risks: Highlight any potential risks to improving or maintaining this rating over the coming year.</td></tr>
<tr><td>2. Good capability
(predominantly green)</td></tr>
<tr><td>3. Some capability
(predominantly amber)</td></tr>
<tr><td>4. Little or no capability
(predominantly red)</td></tr>
</table>

Improvement Plan

The self-appraisal should not be undertaken as a one-off exercise, which would have limited value, but rather should be repeated regularly – either every year every second year – so that progress can be observed.

The self-appraisal itself provides the basis for preparing an improvement plan, setting out how the organisation aims to build on its strengths in OE&IA and address some of its weaknesses. The organisation would renew its improvement plan after each application of the Self-Appraisal Tool, highlighting the positives and some of the challenges against the previous plan and outlining improvements sought for the year ahead and the support (internal or external) that will be needed.

Sheet 3 illustrates one form an Improvement Plan might take. The group responsible for the self-appraisal, perhaps with additional members, selects some of the indicators (perhaps those felt to be in most urgent need of attention or those which offer most scope for improvement) and, for each of these, plans how to move from Red to Amber/Green, or from Amber to Green. Furthermore, for some indicators it may be necessary to plan actions to sustain a Green. The group describes the types of evidence that would later show whether the improvements have been made, identifies priorities, and assigns responsibility with a target date for completion.

The Improvement Plan could then be signed off by management and submitted to the ACT-D secretariat for mapping improvement commitments across the alliance.

A version of the Organisational Self-Appraisal Tool will be made available as a stand-alone document.

Sheet 3:

An Example of an Improvement Plan

Indicators selected for improvement	Current RAG	RAG planned	Improvement sought	Evidence to confirm (eg policy, process change or evidence of application)	Priority: High or Medium	Responsible person	Time limit

4. Towards good practice in assessing change

In the Self-Appraisal Tool, principle 4 states "We are committed to following good practice in evaluation and impact assessment". After gathering the views of participants in the Global Workshop, and further reflection since then, the following good practices are recommended to organisations seeking to assess what change has occurred and to identify the organisation's contribution.

Establishing good practice is a continuing process. The insights of ACT-D organisations using the Guide and tools will contribute to a better understanding of good practice in assessing change and will be incorporated in the next revision.

The good practices are grouped here under three headings, relating to design of the process and to choice and application of tools.

In designing the process

1. **Set expectations of change when planning, distinguishing between expectations of outcomes and impact.**

   Clarity about what your organisation is trying to achieve and the desired future to which it wishes to contribute, coupled with an understanding of the potential roles of other actors, is essential to planning and provides the basis for subsequent assessment.

2. **Define indicators for outcomes and impact, with means of verification.**

   This helps to pin down what you want to assess and why. Difficulty in defining indicators may point to a lack of clarity about the expectations of outcomes and impact.

3. **Weigh up the costs and benefits when deciding on how frequently to assess change.**

   You need to balance a commitment to assessing your organisation's contribution to change with the costs of assessment, in money and/or time.

4. **Include an independent perspective and be open to constructive criticism.**

   Inviting critical insights from outside and paying attention to them is vital to the organisation's learning, as well as validating the assessment and building credibility for your work.

5. **Seek, through the process, to empower staff and beneficiaries.**

   Encouraging active participation by staff and beneficiaries, and sharing feedback with them, builds capacity for understanding change, increases potential for leverage and helps promote sustainability.

6. **Look for HOW change happened, not only what change or how much, and consider critically the 'theory of change' (explicit or implicit) that underlies an intervention.**

   Though understanding the process of change, and examining and testing your fundamental strategies, your organisation can be better prepared to contribute to change in the future.

In selecting tools

7. **Choose tools that are tried and tested, while being ready to adapt them.**

   Using an established tool (see Chapter 7) enables you to take advantage of the experience of others, but you need to take account of the particular context and the nature of your work. It is especially important that the tools should be accessible to those who will participate in applying them.

8. **Use a mix of tools that allow both quantitative and qualitative evidence to be gathered.**

   In relation to processes of social change, the evidence tends to be largely qualitative. But complementing this with some quantitative evidence greatly strengthens the assessment. This requires baseline data or some alternative basis for comparison.

9. **Select tools that will allow you to disaggregate data as appropriate, by gender or other social differences.**

   This allows you to take into account the perspectives of different groups and to know if any are insufficiently included.

10. **Seek to support both accountability ('proving') and learning ('improving').**

    Assessing change is partly about demonstrating intended results but is also about the need to learn, particularly from setbacks and challenges, so that benefits can result from the process even if outcomes and impact are disappointing.

In the course of assessing

11. **Triangulate through evidence from different sources, including beneficiaries' views.**

    In quantitative evidence, official statistics or data from other agency assessments can complement the data that you gather directly. In qualitative evidence, views from different sources can qualify or reinforce each other.

12. **Use baseline data or some other reference for comparison.**

    Assessing change implies the question 'change from what situation?' If there is a lack of adequate baseline data, you need to be clear about how you are constructing a basis for comparison (e.g.: beneficiary recollection or comparison with similar interventions elsewhere).

13. **Value anecdotal or impressionistic evidence.**

    Fragments of information, impressions and local perceptions that may prove little in themselves can help to build up a broader assessment, especially in the case of impact which can be hard to pin down.

14. **Look for unintended changes.**

    An unintended change may be positive or negative; in either case, it needs to be identified and considered. In the case of harmful changes, it is necessary to reflect on how they may be avoided or mitigated in future interventions.

15. **Consider the sustainability and implications of changes.**

    An evaluation or an impact assessment can provide information about the present situation and how it was reached, but it is important also to consider how firmly entrenched the changes are, whether the process of change is likely to continue, and what are the implications for the future.

16. **Acknowledge the contributions of communities and other stakeholders as well as claiming credit for your organisation where evidence supports this.**

    It is natural and right that an organisation should wish to identify and communicate its contribution to change, but ignoring or under-valuing the contributions of others is misleading and undermines credibility.

5. Navigating the selection of tools

Categorising the tools

The Guide lists the tools alphabetically. To facilitate selection of appropriate tools for users' different contexts and purposes, we first attempt to distinguish between:

» **Tools for planning for impact –** designed for use in planning a project, or during the early stages of implementation, to help manage for impact and facilitate subsequent evaluation and impact assessment.

» **Tools for assessing change –** designed mainly for use during evaluation or impact assessment. Some may be applied periodically, allowing for continuous evaluation.

We further distinguish between:

» **General tools –** designed for a wide range of sectors, and usually requiring little or no specialist knowledge.

» **Specialist tools –** designed for projects relating to particular sectors, often needing to be applied by specialists.

»

	Tools for planning for impact	Tools for assessing change
General	**AI:** Appreciative Inquiry **NGO-IDEAs** Toolbox **OM:** Outcome Monitoring **PIM:** Participatory Impact Monitoring **PIPA:** Participatory Impact Pathways Assessment **SFW:** Social Framework **ToC:** Theory of Change	**CSoC:** Critical Stories of Change **'Making a Difference' Method** **MAPP:** Method for Impact Assessment of Programmes and Projects **MSC:** Most Significant Change **Project-Out / Context-In Approach**
Special ist	**DNH:** Do No Harm (focus on emergency assistance and on conflict transformation) **LQAS:** Lot Quality Assurance Sampling (focus on community-based projects, primarily on HIV) **movie:** Monitoring of Effects (focus on conflict transformation) **PIA:** Poverty Impact Assessment (focus on policy interventions) **RIA:** Rigorous Impact Analysis (focus on statistical methods) **SAGE:** Situational Analysis and Goal Establishment (focus on self-help promotion) **SIA:** Sustainability Impact Assessment (focus on sustainable development)	**CLM:** Composite Logic Model (focus on advocacy and policy change) **Contribution Analysis** (focus on attribution) **LAST:** Livelihood Status Tracking (focus on livelihoods) **PaLSA:** Participatory Livelihood Monitoring (focus on livelihoods) **PCIA:** Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment (focus on conflict transformation)

Steps to select a tool

Users seeking a tool for a particular purpose may find it helpful to follow a determined sequence of steps.

1. The table on the previous page allows you first to narrow down the field of choice, depending on your needs – for planning or assessment, general or specialist.

2. The chapter on rating the tools for usefulness, below, puts forward 17 criteria that may be relevant when considering how useful or appropriate a tool may be for a given context and purpose. It is recommended that you look through the list in order to identify the criteria that are most significant in your case.

3. For each tool, usefulness ratings have been made on those criteria. The results are summarised in the matrix of usefulness ratings. The key ratings for you are those at the intersections of the relevant rows (potential tools identified in the first step) and columns (criteria selected in the second step). You may wish to circle the higher ones (4 and 5). On this basis, you can make a short list of the most promising tools.

4. Study the one-page summaries for the short-listed tools, following up by reference to the websites and/or publications cited, to find the most suitable tool or tools. As a further aid, ACT-D will later make available, as an appendix to this Guide, fuller descriptions of some of the tools.

5. Having made a selection, there will still be scope for innovation. The tools in this Guide are not offered as blueprints, but for adaptation to the specific needs and capabilities of users. It may be necessary to combine elements from two or more tools to obtain the best result.

6. Rating the tools for usefulness

Criteria

Usefulness ratings have been assigned to each tool (ranging from 1 low to 5 high) in relation to 17 criteria touching on some of the methodological challenges involved in assessing change. Thus a potential user, considering which of these challenges are of most concern in a particular case, can form a view about how appropriate the tool might be.

For some of the tools, the ratings were made, with comments, by the authors or by other specialists. But in any case the ratings are subjective, often depending on the context of the application and the skill to adapt it to a certain situation.

» **Impact as well as outcomes**
To what extent does the tool seek to study impact, and not only outcomes?

» **Measurement (Quantitative Data)**
How far does the tool allow for quantitative analysis of change?

» **Description (Qualitative Data)**
How far does the tool allow for qualitative analysis of change?

» **Attribution of change**
How well does the tool deal with attribution of change and the exploration of cause-effect relationships?

» **Independent of baselines**
How well does the tool cope without the existence of baseline data?

» **Independent of indicators**
How well does the tool cope without the existence of pre-determined indicators?

» **"Proving", giving evidence for accountability**
To what extent does the tool provide evidence of change?

» **"Improving", promoting critical reflection**
To what extent does the tool promote critical reflection among participants?

- **Local participation**
  To what extent does the tool explicitly take a participatory and empowering approach that includes the people intended as 'beneficiaries'?

- **Aggregation**
  To what extent does the tool allow for aggregation of outcomes or impact across groups affected (e.g. those in different geographical areas or those affected by different projects implemented by an organisation)?

- **Disaggregation**
  To what extent does the tool support differentiated analysis of change among different groups affected (e.g. socio-economic, ethnic or cultural groups)?

- **Gender disaggregation**
  To what extent does the tool specifically support differentiated analysis of change by women and men, girls and boys?

- **Use by implementing staff**
  How appropriate is the tool for direct use by front-line implementing staff?

- **Use by communities**
  How appropriate is the tool for direct use by communities?

- **Useable with limited literacy**
  How appropriate is the tool for direct use by people with limited literacy?

- **Transparency and feedback**
  To what extent does the tool incorporate feedback on findings to implementing staff and those being assessed?

- **Sector coverage**
  To what extent is the tool applicable across diverse sectors?

The "**Usefulness Rating Matrix**" on next page offers an overview of the appropriateness or usefulness of each tool with regard to the criteria.

Matrix of usefulness ratings

(Ratings 1 low – 5 high)

Name of tool / Criteria	**Impact as well as outcome**	**Measurement** (quantitative data)	**Description** (qualitative data)	**Attribution of Change**	**Indepenent of baselines**	**Independent of indicators**	**“Proving”**	**“Improving”**	**Local Participation**	**Aggregation**	**Disaggregation**	**Gender disaggregation**	**Use by implementing staff**	**Use by communities**	**Useable with limited literacy**	**Transparency and feedback**	**Sector Coverage**
Appreciative Inquiry (AI)	5	1	3	1	5	5	3	5	5	5	3	1	5	5	4	5	5
Composite Logic Model (CLM)	5	5	5	2	3	3	5	5	4	2	1	1	5	5	3	5	5
Contribution Analysis	2	2	2	5	4	3	3	3	2	3	3	1	2	1	1	3	5
Critical Stories of Change (CSoC)	4	2	4	4	3	4	4	5	5	1	3	5	4	3	3	3	5
Do No Harm (DNH)	5	1	5	5	2	1	1	5	1	3	5	4	5	1	1	3	4
Livelihood Asset Status Tracking (LAST)	4	5	3	3	5	4	4	4	4	5	4	1	5	2	2	3	3
Lot Quality Assurance Sampling (LQAS)	2	5	1	2	3	4	2	5	4	4	2	2	4	2	1	4	4
‘Making a Difference’ Method	5	1	2	3	5	5	3	3	4	2	3	3	2	2	2	3	5
Method for Impact Assessment of Programmes and Projects (MAPP)	4	3	5	4	5	5	3	5	5	4	4	4	5	5	4	3	5
Monitoring of Effects (movie)	3	1	5	3	5	5	3	5	1	3	3	3	5	1	1	3	3
Most Significant Change (MSC)	5	1	5	3	2	1	3	5	4	2	1	2	4	2	1	5	5
NGO-IDEAs Toolbox	4	5	4	3	3	5	4	5	4	5	5	3	3	4	2	5	3
Outcome Mapping (OM)	1	3	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	4	5	5
Participatory Impact Monitoring (PIM)	4	2	3	2	4	5	2	5	5	1	3	3	5	5	1	5	3
Participatory Impact Pathways Assessment (PIPA)	3	3	3	3	4	4	3	5	5	2	4	4	5	4	3	4	4
Participatory Livelihood Monitoring (PaLSA)	4	2	5	5	5	2	3	5	4	5	2	2	5	5	2	3	3
Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment (PCIA)	5	1	5	5	2	4	3	5	2	1	1	1	3	1	1	3	2
Poverty Impact Assessment (PIA)	5	4	4	4	1	2	3	3	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	3	3
‘Project-In / Context-Out’ Approach	5	2	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	2	3	4	1	1	1	3	5
Rigorous Impact Analysis (RIA)	5	5	3	4	1	1	4	2	1	5	5	5	2	1	1	2	2
Situational Analysis and Goal Establishment (SAGE)	4	5	4	4	1	5	5	5	4	5	4	3	4	4	2	3	4
Social Framework	3	4	1	4	2	2	2	2	2	4	5	1	3	1	1	2	5
Sustainability Impact Assessment (SIA)	5	5	3	2	2	2	5	2	1	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	4
Theory of Change (ToC)	5	5	5	4	3	4	4	5	4	4	4	4	3	3	1	4	5

7. Tools

Appreciative Inquiry (AI)

Short description

AI is an approach to organizational change and development, based on the premise that organizations change in the direction in which they inquire. By attempting to appreciate what is good about an organization, more positive aspects will surface. They can then be built on so that the best becomes the norm. The main intervention model is the 4-D cycle consisting of discovery, dream, design and destiny. Usually, an AI process takes place at an "Appreciative Inquiry Summit", a large group event.

Purpose

Organizational change and development through collaborative inquiry in which many people can be involved. The focus is on what works well in an organization, to make that a foundation for future development.

Origin

Developed by Case Western Reserve University in Cleveland, Ohio in the 1970s.

Scope of application

Sector: Social Projects
Context: Organizational development and change
Phase: Initiating change processes.

Key steps

4-D cycle:

1. Discovery: appreciating what is
2. Dream: imagining what could be
3. Design: determining what could be
4. Destiny: creating what will be.

Advantages	Limitations
AI builds on what is positive in an organization. A focus on positive reinforcement can have real and lasting effects.	

Conditions needed for application

Openness for a different approach to organizational change.

Resource implications

Time: Approximately four days
Stakeholders involved: The more the stakeholders are involved the better
Staff input: Act as interviewers and providers of positive stories about the organization.

Compatibility with other tools

Sources of support

Websites: http://www.new-paradigm.co.uk/Appreciative.htm

ACT-D members using it

Availability in other languages

Available in English and in German.

Usefulness ratings for Appreciative Inquiry (AI)

Criteria of usefulness/ appropriateness	**Ratings** (1 low – 5 high)	**Comments by authors or other experts** (available for some of the tools)
Impact as well as outcomes	5	
Measurement (quantitative)	1	
Description (qualitative)	3	
Attribution of change	1	
Independent of baselines	5	
Independent of indicators	5	
"Proving"	3	
"Improving"	5	
Local participation	5	
Aggregation	5	
Disaggregation	3	
Gender disaggregation	1	
Use by implementing staff	5	
Use by communities	5	
Useable with limited literacy	4	
Transparency and feedback	5	
Sector coverage	5	

Composite Logic Model (CLM)

Short description

The Advocacy & Policy Change Composite Logic Model facilitates theory of change or logic model development for advocacy and policy change efforts (often the first step of evaluation planning). It offers a comprehensive menu of ingredients (inputs, activities, outcomes, policy goals and impacts) that might go into an advocacy logic model and allows users to select the components that are most relevant to their work. It addresses a common question about advocacy evaluation: what kind of outcomes can or should be measured, other than achievement of a public policy goal? Accompanying guiding questions, definitions, and examples support the application of the tool.

Purpose

To help advocates, donors and evaluators to articulate an advocacy strategy, and to guide decisions about the design of an advocacy and policy change evaluation.

Origin

Harvard Family Research Project, The California Endowment, The Atlantic Philanthropies and Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2007.

Scope of application

Sector: Advocacy and policy change
Context: Articulation of an advocacy strategy or theory of change
Phase: Planning and evaluation.

Key steps involved in using it

The following eight questions guide users on how to use the model for articulating an advocacy strategy:

1. What is the advocacy or policy goal?
2. Who is the audience?
3. What will it take to convince or move the audience?
4. What contextual factors might affect the strategy's success?
5. Where doesn't the strategy need to focus?
6. What will strategy collaborators do?
7. What will the opposition or competition do?
8. Is there a contingency plan?

The following five questions are relevant in regard to guide decisions about the design of an advocacy and policy change evaluation:

1. Which components are relevant to the advocacy strategy?
2. Given the evaluation's intended users and use, which outcomes are priorities?
3. Are there outcomes the strategy should not be directly accountable for?
4. Given the evaluation timeframe, which outcomes are achievable?
5. Given the evaluation resources available, which outcomes are best pursued?

Advantages	Limitations

Conditions needed for application

Resource implications

Time expenditure:

Stakeholders involved: Participatory approaches in all phases.

Staff input:

Compatibility with other tools

Sources of support

Website: http://www.innonet.org/index.php?section_id=101&content_id=633

ACT-D members using it

Availability in other languages

Available in English only.

Usefulness ratings for Composite Logic Model (CLM) – comments by Julia Coffman

Criteria of usefulness/ appropriateness	Ratings (1 low – 5 high)	Comments by authors or other experts (available for some of the tools)
Impact as well as outcomes	5	The model includes both policy-related outcomes and impacts for advocacy efforts.
Measurement (quantitative)	5	The model includes both outcomes and impacts that can be assessed using quantitative measures and analyses.
Description (qualitative)	5	The model includes both outcomes and impacts that can be assessed using qualitative measures and analyses.
Attribution of change	2	The model emphasizes the assessment of progress toward policy change and impacts to demonstrate that an advocacy effort made a contribution in the change process rather than a cause-and-effect determination of attribution.
Independent of baselines	3	
Independent of indicators	3	
"Proving"	5	The model emphasizes the assessment of progress toward policy change and impacts.
"Improving"	5	
Local participation	4	
Aggregation	2	
Disaggregation	1	
Gender disaggregation	1	
Use by implementing staff	5	
Use by communities	5	
Useable with limited literacy	3	
Transparency and feedback	5	
Sector coverage	5	

Contribution Analysis

Short description

Contribution analysis is an approach to monitoring and evaluation that emphasises the question of attribution, while accepting that attribution cannot be proved, only indicated. Contribution analysis consists of six key steps to provide evidence that reduces the uncertainty about the contribution made.

Purpose

To provide evidence about the contribution that a program makes to the outcomes it is trying to influence.

Origin

Office of the Auditor General of Canada (John Mayne), 1999.

Scope of application

Sector: Aid and development assistance programs
Context: Applicable in many contexts
Phase: Monitoring and evaluation (with emphasis on attribution).

Key steps involved in using it

» Develop the results chain (the program logic)
» Assess the existing evidence on results and determine the respective indicators
» Identify and assess alternative explanations for program outcome and present evidence to discount them
» Document the performance story of the program
» Seek out additional evidence in order to reduce uncertainty regarding attribution
» Revise and strengthen performance story

Advantages

Contribution analysis provides evidence to reduce the uncertainty about the contribution made. In this context, program staff have been shown to be more comfortable with targets that are to be strived for but cannot easily be met.

Limitations

So far, limitations or challenges observed can be related to the way contribution analysis has been applied rather than to the approach itself.

Conditions needed for application

In order to be effective, contribution analysis requires clear program logic (result chain).

Resource implications

Stakeholders involved: Participatory approaches applicable.

Compatibility with other tools

Sources of support

Websites: http://www.aes.asn.au/conferences/2006/papers/022%20Fiona%20Kotvojs.pdf
http://www.oag-bvg.gc.ca/internet/docs/99dp1_e.pdf.

ACT-D members using it

Availability in other languages

Available in English only.

Usefulness ratings for Contribution Analysis

Criteria of usefulness/ appropriateness	Ratings (1 low – 5 high)	Comments by authors or other experts (available for some of the tools)
Impact as well as outcomes	2	
Measurement (quantitative)	2	
Description (qualitative)	2	
Attribution of change	5	
Independent of baselines	4	
Independent of indicators	3	
"Proving"	3	
"Improving"	3	
Local participation	2	
Aggregation	3	
Disaggregation	3	
Gender disaggregation	1	
Use by implementing staff	2	
Use by communities	1	
Useable with limited literacy	1	
Transparency and feedback	3	
Sector coverage	5	

Critical Stories of Change (CSoC)

Short description

Based on awareness that change was not linear as in a logical framework, CSoC was developed to facilitate learning at every level. Stakeholders undertake a participatory process to explore from different perspectives how change in a project (positive and negative) occurs and how development organisations are involved. The resulting narrative is critical and journalistic, unlike that of a conventional case study.

Purpose

To explore how change happens from the perspective of different stakeholders. People learn about relationships in development and how they can be engaged, and look at how they can work better, get recognition of the story, and tell it so that understanding is shared.

Origin

Developed by ActionAid in 2004.

Scope of application

Sector: Rural development, education, health, poverty reduction, conflict resolution, rights-based work

Context: Applicable in different cultural contexts; willingness of stakeholders to participate and change is vital

Phase: May be applied during any phase, especially planning, monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment.

Key steps

Preparation

- A local CSoC team is built up; this team is responsible for purpose-related research
- Definition of the focus of the investigation
- Definition of Key Questions guiding the process.

Implementation

- Facilitating learning
- Writing.

Analysis

- Levering of change.

Advantages

Process-driven

High quality

Context specific

Democratic

Promotes critical reflection.

Limitations

Aggregation is difficult.

Conditions needed for application

Resource implications

Time: Depends on purpose and focus, perhaps including 3-day introductory workshop

Stakeholders involved: Participative approach

Staff input: Facilitators implementing workshop; process team preferably of local people with a certain distance from the focused topic.

Compatibility with other tools

Sources of support

Website: www.actionaid.org/assets/pdf%5CLove%20of%20the%20Heart_1112006_162112.pdf

ACT-D members using it

Availability in other languages

Available in English only.

Usefulness ratings for CSoC – comments by Kate Carroll, ActionAid

Criteria of usefulness/ appropriateness	**Ratings** (1 low – 5 high)	**Comments by authors or other experts** (available for some of the tools)
Impact as well as outcomes	4	
Measurement (quantitative)	2	It allows for it in the sense that it can be built into the ToRs but does not necessarily do this in all cases.
Description (qualitative)	4	
Attribution of change	4	Again, this is the ideal.
Independent of baselines	3	It seeks to analyse what is available and complement this with primary data.
Independent of indicators	4	It sets its own questions ("key questions").
"Proving"	4	Both qualitative and quantitative (if available).
"Improving"	5	
Local participation	5	
Aggregation	1	Aggregation seems to be difficult.
Disaggregation	3	The methodology attempts to look at all levels, but the interest is with the poor and vulnerable.
Gender disaggregation	5	This is the intention but it is not realised in all of the stories.
Use by implementing staff	4	The method is very useful if achieved effectively (5), but the product is not - hence the average.
Use by communities	3	The method is very useful if achieved effectively (5), but the product is not - hence the average.
Useable with limited literacy	3	The method is very useful (5), but the product is not - hence the average.
Transparency and feedback	3	
Sector coverage	5	Multiple.

Do No Harm (DNH)

Short description

Interventions in conflict areas, whatever the sector, influence the conflict, becoming part of the context and perhaps having unintended or negative impacts. DNH is a planning tool to minimize anticipated negative impacts of an intervention by identifying war capacities or "dividers" and peace capacities or "connectors".

Purpose

To help projects be designed in ways that do not intensify or prolong violent conflict but contribute to peace, minimising potentially negative impacts and maximising potentially positive impacts of an intervention. The focus is on processes, resource transfers and implicit ethical messages; and on unintended outcomes and impacts.

Origin

Do No Harm was developed by the Local Capacities for Peace Project (Mary B. Anderson).

Scope of application

Sector: Developed for emergency assistance; but applicable to other sectors

Context: Projects intervening in conflict areas

Phase: Mostly at the beginning, but also in the course of an intervention, at the end and ex post.

Key steps

Preparation

Assessment of the context.

Implementation (workshops)

1. Identification of "dividers", tensions, and war capacities; assessment of their respective relevance; distinction between root causes and more recent (partly manipulated) causes.
2. Identification of "connectors" and peace capacities; assessment of their respective importance.
3. Assessment of the characteristics of the implementing organisation and of the intervention.

Analysis

1. Analysis of how the organisation and the intervention can affect war capacities and peace capacities
2. Development of intervention options
3. Where necessary, testing of new intervention design.

Advantages

Is a highly elaborated instrument

Facilitates early perception of conflict-escalating impacts of an intervention

Promotes attention to relationships between groups in affected regions

Reveals connections between different decisions related to an intervention

Human rights may be included

Gender analysis may be included when analysing dividers and connectors.

Limitations

Transparency may be limited for those not involved in workshops

May promote a bipolar perspective: peace promoting v. conflict promoting factors

Focus on anticipated negative impacts may be too strong.

Conditions needed for application

Resource implications

Time: Approximately one day; less if used as part of monitoring; 1 to 2 days for initiation

Stakeholders involved: Flexible; target group does not need to be involved.

Compatibility with other tools

Sources of support

Website: http://www.cdainc.com/cdawww/project_profile.php?pid=DNH&pname=Do%20No%20Harm

Bibliography: Anderson, Mary B. 1999: Do No Harm: How Aid can support Peace – or War. Lynne Rienner, Boulder/ London.

ACT-D members using it

Availability in other languages

Available in English and French.

Usefulness ratings for Do No Harm (DNH)

Criteria of usefulness/ appropriateness	**Ratings** (1 low – 5 high)	**Comments by authors or other experts** (available for some of the tools)
Impact as well as outcomes	5	
Measurement (quantitative)	1	
Description (qualitative)	5	
Attribution of change	5	
Independent of baselines	2	
Independent of indicators	1	
“Proving”	1	
“Improving”	5	
Local participation	1	
Aggregation	3	
Disaggregation	5	
Gender disaggregation	4	
Use by implementing staff	5	
Use by communities	1	
Useable with limited literacy	1	
Transparency and feedback	3	
Sector coverage	4	

Livelihood Asset Status Tracking (LAST)

Short description

It is a rapid impact monitoring system designed with primary stakeholders and based on the Sustainable Rural Livelihoods conceptual framework. The observation of the dynamics of five capital assets essential to household livelihoods is used as a proxy for impact. The situation is assessed during participatory workshops in which "word pictures" are created to facilitate identification of a number of stages from worst to best situation known locally. The result is a tool (assessment sheet) that is used for rapid enumeration of repeat panel households. Thus the qualitative understanding of different household situations is converted into a graded centile scale.

Purpose

To detect changes in the livelihood asset status of large numbers of households, which, when aggregated, can provide an indication of the project's overall impact on livelihoods; and to reflect on the results with a view to adjusting the project so as to improve effectiveness and impact.

Origin

Developed by IDPM, University of Manchester, UK and Development Tracks, New Delhi, India, 2002

Scope of application

Sector: Rural development, poverty reduction, education, health, income generation

Context: Applicable in different cultural contexts with active participation of project team and beneficiaries

Phase: Primarily during the phase of implementation as a tool for impact monitoring (frequency between three months and a year) but also as an ex post evaluation tool.

Conditions needed for application

Accompaniment of the process by external consultant(s)

Care over quality of Assessment Sheet and maintenance of enumerator judgement.

Key steps

Phase of preparation: Participatory workshops to develop assessment sheet and field testing

Phase of implementation: Survey of sample households guided by the assessment sheet

Phase of analysis: Statistical analysis; verification and discussion with staff and beneficiaries

Advantages

Rapid

Participatory

Applicable to a large number of households

Incorporates local perspectives

Provides a dynamic picture of changes

Limitations

No information on intra-household conditions

Risk of bias in enumeration

Attribution of impact informal unless 'with and without' or rolling baseline is incorporated

Still evolving as a tool with many questions pending

Conditions needed for application

Resource implications

Time: Approximately four days of workshops and field testing to develop the system; comparatively little time for the survey

Stakeholders involved: Participatory process involving beneficiaries and staff

Staff input: Staff as facilitators, to develop the assessment sheet, and as enumerators

Compatibility with other tools

Sources of support

Website: http://www.livelihoods.org/info/tools/LAST.html

Bibliography: Bond R. et al. 2007 'Monitoring the Livelihood Platform: Reflections on the Operation of LAST Method from INDIA and Malawi', Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal, 25(4) pp301-315, Beech Tree Publishing, UK.

ACT-D members using it

Availability in other languages

Available in English only.

Usefulness ratings for LAST – comments by Richard Bond

Criteria of usefulness/ appropriateness	Ratings (1 low – 5 high)	Comments by authors or other experts (available for some of the tools)
Impact as well as outcomes	4	Assesses changes in the household livelihood platform, this is commonly used at both outcome and impact levels but more usually at impact level.
Measurement (quantitative)	5	Converts qualitative assessment into scores
Description (qualitative)	3	Incorporates locally meaningful descriptions
Attribution of change	3	Primarily informal attribution at field-level unless 'with and without' sampling or incorporation of a rolling baseline. Disaggregation by area and capital facilitates explanation.
Independent of baselines	5	The first assessment becomes a de facto baseline, repeat surveys show dynamic change.
Independent of indicators	4	Professionals define what needs to be assessed, beneficiaries define how to assess. Avoids pre-determined indicators.
"Proving"	4	Regular assessments give good evidence for change.
"Improving"	4	Sample participants reflect on household changes periodically with field assessors. Explanation of change is open to interpretation.
Local participation	4	Beneficiary 'word-pictures' used for assessment. Informal interviews and observation used in assessments.
Aggregation	5	Primarily used at various levels of aggregation, not so reliable in household comparisons.
Disaggregation	4	Household groupings other than geographical ones can be assessed against combined or disaggregated capitals.
Gender disaggregation	1	To some extent such concerns can be incorporated in the assessment sheet but it applies to household level primarily.
Use by implementing staff	5	Designed for field-level interpretation, enumeration by field staff and/or community members.
Use by communities	2	Risk of bias must be overseen and managed.
Useable with limited literacy	2	Attempts to use pictoral version failed. Basic literacy required.
Transparency and feedback	3	This depends on the policy of the organisation but graphical output is available for community groups and individual locations.
Sector coverage	3	Developed for Sustainable Livelihood projects and so assesses change to all household capital assets. It is not sector-specific.

Lot Quality Assurance Sampling (LQAS)

Short description

The geographical area affected by a project is divided into smaller sites (lots), to enable performance in different sites to be compared over time, so that more effort and resources can be directed to poorer-performing sites.

Purpose

To support the identification of geographical areas which are performing either significantly well or significantly poor in relation to implementation and/or outcome variables.

Origin

Joseph Valadez.

Scope of application

Sector: Multiple

Context: Community-based programming/service delivery

Phase: During collection of baseline data for outcome variables, and periodically thereafter for both implementation and outcome variables.

Key steps involved in using it

Phase of preparation

The area is divided into smaller sites. Indicators on implementation adequacy and/or outcome performance are defined for variables of interest, with means of verification (e.g. questionnaires) for these indicators. Upper and lower thresholds are set for the indicators under investigation. The binominal formula (made practical with the SampleLQ calculator) is used to define the sample size (n) and the number of permissible failures (d) within the sample for the indicator in question.

Phase of implementation

Data on indicators of implementation adequacy and/or outcome performance are collected on a relatively small sample of points in each site as determined by the binomial formula.

Phase of analysis

When "d" exceeds the permissible number of failures, the performance of the site is considered inadequate. The organisation can be reasonably confidant that sites with true population parameters at or above the upper threshold are classified correctly, and the same for sites whose true population parameters are at or below the lower threshold. Sites whose true population parameters are between the upper and lower performance thresholds have a greater chance of being misclassified, but this does not seriously compromise the purpose, which is to channel effort and resources to sites where performance is poor and avoid doing so where performance is very good.

Advantages

Permits the identification of specific sites where implementation and/or outcome performance is poor.

Site data can be weighted and aggregated together to derive point estimates on the whole area.

Limitations

Only applies to variables that are conducive to quantitative measurement.

Necessitates significant data collection and analysis, as well as the requisite capability.

Does not deal with the "attribution dilemma"

Conditions needed for application

Resource implications

Time: Needs sufficient time for data collection and analysis.

Stakeholders involved: Conducted by programme staff

Staff input: Social science capabilities necessary for questionnaires, data collection and analysis.

Compatibility with other tools

Sources of support

Website: http://www.coregroup.org/working_groups/lqas_train.html

ACT-D members using it

Christian Aid (contact Karl Hughes, karl@christainaid-nbi.org)

Availability in other languages

Available in English only.

Usefulness ratings for Lot Quality Assurance Sampling (LQAS)

Criteria of usefulness/ appropriateness	**Ratings** (1 low – 5 high)	**Comments by authors or other experts** (available for some of the tools)
Impact as well as outcomes	2	
Measurement (quantitative)	5	
Description (qualitative)	1	
Attribution of change	2	
Independent of baselines	3	
Independent of indicators	4	
"Proving"	2	
"Improving"	5	
Local participation	4	
Aggregation	4	
Disaggregation	2	
Gender disaggregation	2	
Use by implementing staff	4	
Use by communities	2	
Useable with limited literacy	1	
Transparency and feedback	4	
Sector coverage	4	

‘Making a Difference’ Method

Short description

‘Making a Difference’ is a study conducted by staff of a funding/support agency, using semi-structured interviews with a range of stakeholders to gather evidence of lasting and significant changes in people’s lives and livelihoods, of the extent to which those changes, or impact, can be attributed to the work of the organisation implementing a project, and of the contribution made by the support that the funding partner has provided.

Purpose

‘Making a Difference’ is intended to provide an insight (relevant if not systematic) into the impact of a programme of funding and other support for the development activities of various partners.

Origin

The tool was developed in 2005 by Alonso Roberts for the Latin America, Caribbean and Global Division of Christian Aid (UK and Ireland), looking at diverse projects spread over a wide geographical area.

Scope of application

Sector: Applicable to development interventions in a wide range of sectors.

Context: Applicable in diverse cultural contexts, assuming only stakeholders’ readiness to contribute their views.

Phase: Developed for ex post impact assessment.

Key steps involved in using it

Phase of preparation

» Identify the basis of the study – thematic, geographical, etc.
» Devise framework for selecting projects, with range of organisation types, length of partnership and capacity.
» Decide which staff of the funding/support agency will be involved.
» Agree on common format for interviews and perhaps for a workshop with ‘beneficiaries’; and for the reports.

Phase of implementation – for each of the projects studied:

» Share Methodology with the partner, stressing that the study is part of a wider learning process; with partner, identify individuals for interviews (covering wide range of stakeholders), and consider feasability of workshop.
» Conduct the interviews and provide initial feedback to partners, in the course of a single visit.
» Write up the report according to the agreed framework, and share it with other staff and with the partner.

Phase of analysis

» For the sample of projects or programme, write a consolidated report bringing together shared features and contrasts between the individual reports, and share it in the agency and with key partners.
» Discuss the implications what has been learned and set a date for review of how any changes are applied.

Advantages

» Focuses on impact – perceived changes in the lives of people and communities
» Values the views of ‘beneficiaries’ and others
» Does not depend on indicators or baseline data
» Pays particular attention to attribution, including the role of a funding agency
» Can be used in diverse contexts and sectors
» Does not require special training or expertise.

Limitations

» Sample of projects may not be representative
» Depends largely on subjective impressions
» Does little to promote systematic analysis
» Does not lend itself to formal aggregation.

Conditions needed for application

Adequate freedom to interview diverse stakeholders, including organisational and community leaders.

Resource implications

Time: Each individual study requires 2 agency staff (perhaps one who is involved with the project, one not) for up to ten days including write-up. Further staff time is needed for consolidated report, learning and follow-up.

Stakeholders involved: Various stakeholders at all project levels provide insights on change and attribution.

Staff input: The study is planned and conducted by staff.

Compatibility with other tools

This could readily be used with most other tools, whether as a complementary survey of stakeholder views or to provide a more specific focus on impact.

Sources of support

Bibliography:‘Making a Difference’ guidelines available from the Support for Accountability and Learning Team at Christian Aid via info@christian-aid.org.

ACT-D members using it

Used by Christian Aid within its Latin America and Caribbean programme.

Usefulness ratings for 'Making a Difference' Method – comments by Alonso Roberts, CESE

Criteria of usefulness/ appropriateness	Ratings (1 low – 5 high)	Comments by authors or other experts (available for some of the tools)
Impact as well as outcomes	5	The tool looks specifically at impact.
Measurement (quantitative)	1	The tool makes no provision for quantitative analysis of change.
Description (qualitative)	2	The tool looks at change but the evidence obtained is more descriptive than analytical.
Attribution of change	3	The tool focuses on the issue of attribution through the perceptions of diverse stakeholders, permitting comparison and triangulation.
Independent of baselines	5	The tool does not rely on baseline data; rather, it asks people to look backwards and report what changes they see.
Independent of indicators	5	The tool does not rely on pre-determined indicators, though where these exist they could be referred to.
"Proving"	3	The tool seeks to provide evidence of change in the perceptions of stakeholders.
"Improving"	3	The tool should promote critical reflection, but this may not be sufficiently built in to the procedure.
Local participation	4	The views of all, including 'beneficiaries' are sought and taken into account.
Aggregation	2	The tool only allows for aggregation of an informal or impressionistic nature.
Disaggregation	3	The tool does not stipulate such disaggregation but it can readily be incorporated into a particular study through the choice of interviewees.
Gender disaggregation	3	The tool does not stipulate gender disaggregation but it can readily be incorporated into a particular study through the choice of interviewees.
Use by implementing staff	2	Front-line implementing staff should be included among the interviewees but will not be responsible for the study.
Use by communities	2	People in the communities (including 'beneficiaries') should be included among the interviewees but will not be responsible for the study.
Useable with limited literacy	2	The study demands literacy among those carrying it out, but people with limited literacy can readily be included among those interviewed.
Transparency and feedback	3	The tool stipulates feedback at project level after the interviews, as well as sharing of the report.
Sector coverage	5	The tool could be used in many different sectors.

Method for Impact Assessment of Programmes and Projects (MAPP)

Short description

MAPP is a stakeholder-centred tool based on structured group discussions. It was developed to investigate outcome and impact. MAPP can be used as a whole or some of its individual instruments can be selected for use. Most of the instruments use a rating system, which makes it possible to quantify and aggregate the originally qualitative results. The tool is relatively simple and easy to use.

Purpose

MAPP was designed for projects/communities where baseline data is lacking, enabling changes to be identified and attributed to project activities.

Origin

Developed in 1999 by Susanne Neubert, German Development Institute (GDI), Bonn.

Scope of application

Sector: Developed to consider changes in livelihoods, access to resources, expansion of knowledge and participation in rights, but can be applied in any sector.

Context: Poverty alleviation projects, in particular

Phase: Developed for ex post evaluation.

Key steps involved in using it

Phase of implementation

- "Life Lines" = Identification of minimal social factors
- "Trend Analysis" = Generation of a sophisticated picture of the village's social development.
- "List of Activities" = Identification of the relevant project activities (or any intervention in the community)
- "Influence Matrices" = Attribution of the observed changes to project activities
- "Direct Observation" = Systematic field inspection (transect walk) and situation analysis.

Phase of analysis

- Compilation of development and impact profile
- Possible use of the findings in participatory development planning..

Advantages

- Adequate tool in the absence of baseline data
- Participative instrument in the style of PRA, with active involvement of the beneficiaries.
- Identification of the most influential activities and the most influenced changes.

Limitations

- Data collected reflect the subjective estimations of the participants and do not into account 'hard facts' that could serve as a baseline for later impact studies.

Conditions needed for application

If the team is experienced in PRA tools, 1-2 days of training are necessary. Without experience in PRA, the team will need about 5 days of preparation.

Resource implications

Time: 2 or 3 days per village or community (complete sequence); about 1 day (short version)

Stakeholders involved: Beneficiaries are enabled to analyse relevant changes in their communities and to identify the interventions that contributed to these changes

Staff input: Two facilitators (project personnel or external experts)

Compatibility with other tools

Compatible with tools such as Focus Group Discussion and Participatory Rural Appraisal.

Sources of support

Website: http://www.die-gdi.de/CMS-Homepage/openwebcms3.nsf/(ynDK_contentByKey)/MSIN-7JJHP8?Open&nav=expand:Forschung%20und%20Beratung\Projekte;active:Forschung%20und%20Beratung\Projekte\MSIN-7JJHP8

Bibliography: Neubert, Susanne (2002): Social Impact Analysis of Poverty Alleviation Programmes and Projects. A Contribution to the Debate on the Methodology of Evaluation in Development Cooperation, GDI book series Vol. 14, F. Cass Publ., London, 2000.

ACT-D members using it

Availability in other languages

Available in English and German.

Usefulness ratings for MAPP – comments by Susanne Neubert, DIE (abridged)

Criteria of usefulness/ appropriateness	**Ratings** (1 low – 5 high)	**Comments by authors or other experts** (available for some of the tools)
Impact as well as outcomes	4	Impacts and outcomes can be assessed with MAPP, as long as they are perceivable on the ground and by the participants of the focus group discussions (beneficiaries and stakeholders).
Measurement (quantitative)	3	In principle MAPP is a qualitative approach. The rating system allows the results of several sessions to be aggregated. But any further calculations using the ratings should be done carefully.
Description (qualitative)	5	The focus of the analysis lies on qualitative data. Changes are described qualitatively first and validated quantitatively in a second step.
Attribution of change	4	A third step is to attribute changes using also explanations and the rating system, given by the participants of the focus group.
Independent of baselines	5	For ongoing or completed programmes or projects an adequate baseline study is mostly missing. This is why MAPP usually adopts a retrospective view: the development of the past is reconstructed systematically during the MAPP sessions.
Independent of indicators	5	The basis of the analysis is a multidimensional understanding of poverty or of other target systems of development cooperation (eg democracy or decentralization). In case of poverty reduction the key criteria usually concern Livelihoods, Resources, Knowledge and Rights. They can be newly defined criteria or pre-determined indicators (eg MDG).
“Proving”	3	MAPP uses triangulation tools for validation, which are systematically integrated in the sequence of tools used. Cross- checking of data is done with the use of available statistics, documents, transects, expert views and others depending on the subject and intention of the assessment.
“Improving”	5	MAPP builds on focus group discussions, in which consensual explanations and scores for changes and influences are given. If disputes arise, perspectives can be scored separately. In the “Development and Impact profile” it is possible to list different views; the evaluation team can interpret them during reporting.
Local participation	5	MAPP is explicitly based on focus group discussions with beneficiaries and different stakeholders. In addition to that, the tool ends up with a discussion about needs and next steps for further development processes. The results of the MAPP sessions will be left behind for further use by the beneficiaries.
Aggregation	4	The most important results can be aggregated across groups and geographically. MAPP can also include the meso level if focus groups are created at the administrative level. Thus, the view of staff in organisations can also be compared with the view of the beneficiaries.
Disaggregation	4	Different views or disputes are listed if they exist systematically. MAPP provokes discussions among different groups affected. Therefore heterogeneous group compositions are desired (eg men and women in one focus group). If a consensus is not achievable the feature of the controversy is explained and the scoring can then be done along these different views.
Gender disaggregation	4	See above.
Use by implementing staff	5	Front-line implementing staff can use the method if they have facilitating skills and adequate knowledge of the method.
Use by communities	5	The method can be used directly by communities, needing one person to serve as translator and another with experience in facilitation, writing and reading skills and knowledge of MAPP.
Useable with limited literacy	4	See above. Capability of the moderator in drawing pictures can help to some degree if limitations in literacy are pronounced.
Transparency and feedback	3	Feedback to those being assessed is integrated in the concept. An additional feedback loop among evaluator and implementing staff depends on their interests and individual arrangements.
Sector coverage	5	Developed for the natural resources management sector in rural areas in Africa, but has been successfully used in many others.

Monitoring of Effects (movie)

Short description

Movie looks at changes in the behaviour of key actors. It is primarily designed as a tool for projects working to promote peace.

Purpose

Movie focuses on both outcomes and impact – whether the changes are intended or unintended, positive or negative – with regular adaptation to changing conditions.

Origin

The tool was developed by the Institut für Auslandsbeziehungen e. V. (ifa, Institute for Foreign Cultural Relations, Germany), zivik programme (civil conflict resolution) in 2006/2007.

Scope of application

Sector: Civil Conflict Resolution and Peace Building

Context: Applicable in many contexts (rural/urban, local/national)

Phase: Planning, Monitoring, Evaluation.

Key steps involved in using it

Stage 1 – Situation Analysis
Understanding the conflicts and the dynamics behind them, identifying starting points for positive change

- Team composed of internal staff and external contributors allows for differing views and perspectives to be incorporated into the analysis.

Stage 2 – Planning
Identifying desired effects, planning change processes

- Developing a vision for the future: what changes should occur?
- Identifying key actors for the desired changes
- Identifying process indicators
- Making an action plan.

Stage 3 – Monitoring and Evaluation
Incorporating observation and reflection into project activities

- Designing a suitable M&E process.

Stage 4 – Evaluation Workshop
Regular evaluation workshops are held to share and evaluate observations within the project team and to reflect on what adjustments may be needed in the project plan and in future activities.

Advantages	Limitations
Compatibility with standard logframe tool.	

Conditions needed for application

Resource implications

Time: The movie framework accompanies the whole project cycle

Stakeholders involved: Stakeholders of all project levels can be involved

Staff input: In regular evaluation workshops.

Compatibility with other tools

Questionnaire; Focus Group Discussions / Workshops; Most Significant Change; SWOT analysis; Logframe.

Sources of support

Website: http://cms.ifa.de/en/foerderprogramme/zivik/

ACT-D members using it

Availability in other languages

Available in German and English.

Usefulness ratings for Monitoring of Effects (movie)

Criteria of usefulness/ appropriateness	**Ratings** (1 low – 5 high)	**Comments by authors or other experts** (available for some of the tools)
Impact as well as outcomes	3	
Measurement (quantitative)	1	
Description (qualitative)	5	
Attribution of change	3	
Independent of baselines	5	
Independent of indicators	5	
"Proving"	3	
"Improving"	5	
Local participation	1	
Aggregation	3	
Disaggregation	3	
Gender disaggregation	3	
Use by implementing staff	5	
Use by communities	1	
Useable with limited literacy	1	
Transparency and feedback	3	
Sector coverage	3	

Most Significant Change (MSC)

Short description

MSC is a technique for participatory Monitoring and Evaluation. Significant Change (SC) stories are collected and panels of designated stakeholders select the most significant. The value of the changes is discussed and this leads to a dialogue on outcomes and impacts between the hierarchical levels.

Purpose

The purpose relates to learning rather than accountability and may be summarised as follows: to identify significant outcomes and impacts, including unintended changes, to discern the values of an organisation, to encourage analysis, to base management decisions on impact, and to direct the whole team's focus to impact.

Origin

Developed by Rick Davies in a participatory rural development programme in Bangladesh (Davies 1996).

Scope of application

Sector: Applicable in several sectors (e.g. development programmes, agriculture, education, health)

Context: Applicable to many cultural context; MSC has been used in a variety of countries

Phase: During implementation

Other: Complex and large programmes with diverse outcomes or impacts focusing on social change.

Key steps involved in using it

Preparation:	Introduce the tool to the target group and raise interest Select the domains of change to be monitored Define the reporting period and frequency.
Implementation:	Collect SC stories from those involved (respondents allocate their stories to domains) Select the most significant (each level reviews a series of stories and selects the most significant change in each domain, sending selection and selection criteria up to next level; thus the number of stories is reduced; and, finally, a document is produced) Feed back the results of the selection process Verify stories (check accuracy and find out additional information); quantification if possible.
Analysis:	Secondary analysis and meta-monitoring (monitoring the monitoring) Revise the system.

Advantages

- Promotes internal learning
- Does not use predetermined indicators
- The focus is decided upon during implementation
- Subjectivity is made transparent, opinions expressed
- Unintended changes can be identified
- No specific skills needed for implementation
- Promotes analytical thinking
- Lower hierarchical levels are included.

Limitations

- Not adequate for evaluation and accountability
- Subjectivity in the selection process
- Only for societies that speak about mistakes, etc
- People uncomfortable about stating subjective views
- Bias towards popular views
- Large amount of time needed
- Difficulty of eliciting good stories
- Story-telling skills may influence results.

Conditions needed for application

- Organisational culture where it is acceptable to discuss things that go wrong as well as success
- Willingness to try something different
- Infrastructure to enable regular feedback of the results to stakeholders
- Commitment by senior managers.

Resource implications

Time expenditure: High; it is recommended to run several cycles; 1 to 3 days of in-house training

Stakeholders involved: Members of all hierarchical levels and of target group

Staff input: Professionals and non-professionals involved; good facilitation skills are helpful.

Compatibility with other tools

Quantitative tools, interviews, Focus Group Discussions, Direct Observation.

Sources of support

Websites: MSC mailing list: http://groups.yahoo.com/group/mostsignificantchanges

http://www.mande.co.uk/docs/MSCGuide.pdf

Bibliography: Davies, Rick / Dart, Jess (2006): The 'Most Significant Change' Technique: A Guide to Its Use.

Availability in other languages

Bangla (planned), French, Hindi, Indonesian (planned), Malayalam (planned), Russian, Spanish.

Usefulness ratings for Most Significant Change (MSC)

Criteria of usefulness/ appropriateness	**Ratings** (1 low – 5 high)	**Comments by authors or other experts** (available for some of the tools)
Impact as well as outcomes	5	
Measurement (quantitative)	1	
Description (qualitative)	5	
Attribution of change	3	
Independent of baselines	2	
Independent of indicators	1	
“Proving”	3	
“Improving”	5	
Local participation	4	
Aggregation	2	
Disaggregation	1	
Gender disaggregation	2	
Use by implementing staff	4	
Use by communities	2	
Useable with limited literacy	1	
Transparency and feedback	5	
Sector coverage	5	

NGO-IDEAs Toolbox

Short description

The NGO-IDEAs Impact Toolbox offers a combination of four tools that form a methodical whole but may also be applied individually. It is based on tools that many are familiar with and can use independently, without outside consultants. The indicators may be represented quantitatively, facilitating aggregation. The tools encourage reflection and can steer decisions to focus on impact; they can also be used for reporting.

Purpose

To enable the NGO, with the grassroots organisations or the population involved, to steer projects in a manner that will enhance positive impacts and reduce negative ones.

Origin

Developed from 2004 to 2007 in a joint project with contributions from 32 Indian and 14 German NGOs.

Scope of application

Sector: Developed especially for the micro-finance sector; applicable for all sectors with group activities.

Context: Self-help promotion (community or group based projects)

Phase: Developed for monitoring during project implementation.

Key steps involved in using it – here key elements

Participatory Wealth Ranking (PWR): Clusters households according to affluence/poverty criteria. It serves the purpose of poverty-oriented target group selection and assignment of impacts according to wealth/affluence or poverty criteria. PWR is a familiar tool taken from the Participatory Rapid Appraisal (PRA) context.

Situational Analysis and Goal Establishment (SAGE): Looks at changes among individuals and households to see how far each has developed towards their own desired situation. (See separate summary of SAGE, below.)

Performance Appraisal of the Groups (PAG): Looks at changes in groups to assess the quality/performance of a grassroots organisation according to criteria agreed between the NGO and the group.

Performance Assessment of NGOs (PANgo): An impact-analysis tool for NGOs, elaborating the results of SAGE and PAG so that the NGO can analyse causal links with reference to its selected areas of change.

Advantages

» Participatory process, promotes the individual stakeholders' autonomy
» Monitoring focuses on the beneficiaries' objectives
» Indicators are developed deductively out of the beneficiaries' context
» Permits Gender and poverty disaggregation
» Combination of analysis, reflection and dialogue of all stakeholders
» Supports decision-making and reporting in both group and NGO.

Limitations

» Groups need basic capacities for self-monitoring
» Not referred to formal planning

Conditions needed for application

» Communities / groups need a good internal organisation (which is typical in micro finance programmes)
» Instruction and training of NGO staff and beneficiaries is necessary
» Computer skills will be helpful for aggregation and disaggregation.
» Analysis and interpretation have to be learnt.

Resource implications

Time: For NGO staff experienced in PRA tools, 1-2 days of training are necessary; otherwise, the team will need about 5 days of preparation. Implementation integrated to regular work. For community, 3-4 hours for establishment of goals; 2 hours for one monitoring application 2 hours; learned after 3 applications.

Stakeholders involved: Beneficiaries and NGO staff are enabled to analyse relevant changes in the communities and to draw their conclusions, separately and jointly.

Staff input: CEO should guide process; field worker active in the community should integrate the logic into regular work; NGO staff should participate in analysis of monitoring results.

Compatibility with other tools

The NGO-IDEAs Impact Toolbox is readily compatible with PRA, PIM and FGD.

Sources of support

Website: www.ngo-ideas.net

Bibliography: The Impact Toolbox, Version 1.1, 2007. Ed.: NGO-IDEAs; Cochin, India.

ACT-D members using it

Partners in India of Bread for the World and EED.

Availability in other languages

Toolbox available in English only.

Usefulness ratings for NGO-IDEAs Toolbox – comments by Eberhard Gohl, Impact Plus / FAKT

Criteria of usefulness/ appropriateness	Ratings (1 low – 5 high)	Comments by authors or other experts (available for some of the tools
Impact as well as outcomes	4	It seeks to identify any change which is important to people; only as a second step, it analyses the causes of change. It does not discern outcome and impact explicitly.
Measurement (quantitative)	5	For each indicator, the number of households having reached their individual objectives is counted. Qualitative changes are assessed by scoring.
Description (qualitative)	4	Unforeseen change is described. This includes cause-effect-analysis.
Attribution of change	3	With a set of questions, the causes of and consequences of change are analysed.
Independent of baselines	3	It is necessary to establish a baseline. In practice, this can be done retrospectively.
Independent of indicators	5	The community-based organisations develop their own indicators for the objectives they set themselves. These are then maintained. The NGO can add on indicators.
"Proving"	4	The combination of quantitative and qualitative data is helpful for project management and for accountability. The limitation is that it is only verified internally, unless an external evaluation is done.
"Improving"	5	There is a guide for the CBO, NGO and funding organisations to reflect how they can improve, and to start a dialogue on it.
Local participation	4	The toolbox is meant to be applied by grassroots organisations. SAGE and PAG can be managed by themselves. PWR and PANgo have to be facilitated by the NGO.
Aggregation	5	The quantification of change allows easily for aggregation and disaggregation.
Disaggregation	5	The quantification of change allows easily for aggregation and disaggregation.
Gender disaggregation	3	A procedure to measure and describe (for each indicator where it makes sense) the change separately for men and women is part of PANgo. It needs experience and improvement.
Use by implementing staff	3	It is meant to be used mainly by the communities. Implementing staff has to facilitate, but if there intervention is too strong it may be counterproductive.
Use by communities	4	It is meant to be used mainly by the communities. However, a certain experience and a good facilitation are necessary.
Useable with limited literacy	2	At least on e person needs to be literate. However, tools can be used to include illiterates better. Pictorial diaries are one possibility to document change also with illiterate persons.
Transparency and feedback	5	The toolbox has incorporated it fully, giving many examples how it can be done. In practice, it only works if the implementing organisation is actively promoting it.
Sector coverage	3	The toolbox was designed for the microfinance sector, but it is applicable for all types of group or community based self-help projects.

Outcome Mapping (OM)

Short description

OM is a management tool for development projects and consultancies that emphasises learning processes and changes of attitude. Outcomes are defined as changes in the behaviour, relationships, activities or actions of the people, groups and organisations with which a project works directly.

Purpose

OM focuses on outcomes (changes in behaviour, relationships, activities, actions) rather than impact (changes in state) while recognising that impact is the ultimate goal toward which projects work.

Origin

Developed in 2001 by IDRC, Ottawa, with research colleagues in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

Scope of application

Sector: Applicable in any sector, especially where capacity building is an important aspect.
Context: Especially suitable for structurally and thematically complex projects/programs
Phase: Evaluation, planning, strategy.

Key steps involved in using it

Phase of preparation: Introduction of OM by an internal or external facilitator

Phase of implementation: Successive identification / definition of:

» Vision
» Mission
» Project partners
» Challenges for the project partners
» Indicators for progress
» Strategic concepts
» Management tasks to ensure success.

Advantages

» Focus on learning processes and attitude changes
» Helpful for clarification of roles of project partners
» Management instrument, especially during the planning phase
» Possibility of combining OM with other tools.

Limitations

Not suitable for

» Technical and organisational purposes
» The review of quantitative objectives
» Standardised project work.

Conditions needed for application

» Application should start in the planning phase
» All partners must be willing to learn.

Resource implications

Time: Workshop duration: 3 days

Stakeholders involved: Beneficiaries, project staff

Staff input: Facilitation, documentation, introduction.

Compatibility with other tools

Focus Group Discussion, Situation Analysis.

Sources of support

Website: Outcome Mapping online community: http://www.outcomemapping.ca/index.php, moderated by ODI.

And see Sarah Earl et al, IDRC – http://www.idrc.ca/en/ev-9330-201-1-DO_TOPIC.html

ACT-D members using it

Availability in other languages

Available in English only.

Usefulness ratings for Outcome Mapping (OM)

Criteria of usefulness/ appropriateness	**Ratings** (1 low – 5 high)	**Comments by authors or other experts** (available for some of the tools)
Impact as well as outcomes	1	
Measurement (quantitative)	3	
Description (qualitative)	5	
Attribution of change	5	
Independent of baselines	4	
Independent of indicators	5	
“Proving”	5	
“Improving”	5	
Local participation	5	
Aggregation	4	
Disaggregation	5	
Gender disaggregation	5	
Use by implementing staff	5	
Use by communities	5	
Useable with limited literacy	4	
Transparency and feedback	5	
Sector coverage	5	

Participatory Impact Monitoring (PIM)

Short description

PIM consists of two interlinked monitoring systems: group-based monitoring and NGO-based monitoring. In the group-based monitoring, community or group members identify changes they expect from a project, and changes they want to avoid. A group of observers collects information and reports. In periodical "joint reflection meetings", observations and interpretations are shared, and conclusions for further action are drawn.

Purpose

In projects where formal plans may not be useful for controlling implementation, beneficiaries are encouraged to spell out their own objectives. Beneficiaries' observations and assessments are compared regularly with those of NGO (and funding agency) staff. The tool can consider any change that is relevant to the community, paying particular attention to expected changes (outcomes and impacts) and to changes to be avoided.

Origin

Developed in 1993 to 1995 by Eberhard Gohl and Dorsi Germann, FAKT.

Scope of application

Sector: Developed for all sectors.

Context: Self-help promotion (community or group based projects)

Phase: Developed for monitoring during project implementation.

Key steps involved in using it

Phase of preparation:	"What should be watched?" "How can it be watched?" "Who should watch?" "How can results be documented?"
Phase of implementation (with internal analysis):	"What was observed?" "Why these results?" "What action should be taken?"
Phase of analysis (group and NGO together):	Reflection workshops with questions for reflection and action.

Advantages

- Participatory process, promotes individual stakeholders' autonomy
- Combination of analysis, reflection, and dialogue of all stakeholders
- Monitoring system not dependent on plans; can be adapted continuously.

Limitations

Neither includes nor refers to formal planning (can also be seen as an advantage)

Conditions needed for application

- Previous instruction and training of the grassroots organisations is necessary
- Willingness of the NGO to question itself is crucial.
- If NGO staff experienced in PRA tools, 1 or 2 days of training are necessary. Without experience in PRA, the team will need about 5 days of preparation.

Resource implications

Time: Community: 1 day for preparation; 2-3 hours for 2-3 persons for monthly observation; 15 minutes in every meeting for monthly assessment. NGO staff: 1 day for preparation; implementation during regular work. Joint reflection: half a day, once or twice a year.

Stakeholders involved: Beneficiaries and NGO staff enabled to analyse relevant changes in the communities and to draw conclusions, separately and jointly.

Staff input: Field worker active in community; whole NGO team once or twice a year, up to one day.

Compatibility with other tools

PRA; NGO-IDEAs; MAPP; MSC; PaLSA

Sources of support

Website: www.fakt-consult.de

Bibliography: Four booklets on PIM by Dorsi Germann and Eberhard Gohl published by FAKT in 1996.

ACT-D members using it

Bread for the World (partners in Mexico, East Africa).

Availability in other languages

Available in English, Spanish, French, Portuguese, Brazilian Portuguese.

Usefulness ratings for PIM – comments by Eberhard Gohl, Impact Plus / FAKT

Criteria of usefulness/ appropriateness	**Ratings** (1 low – 5 high)	**Comments by authors or other experts** (available for some of the tools)
Impact as well as outcomes	4	PIM focuses on any change that people strive to influence because it corresponds to the expectations or apprehensions of people. It does not discern outcome and impact explicitly.
Measurement (quantitative)	2	Measurement is not implicit; only if the CBO or NGO selects such indicators corresponding to the expectations or fears (i.e. turnover of their enterprise).
Description (qualitative)	3	In practice, the CBO and NGO select descriptive indicators or yes/no questions, adding explanations or descriptions.
Attribution of change	2	There are systematic questions to explore that factors contributing to change, or hindering it.
Independent of baselines	4	The baseline is determined when the indicators are established.
Independent of indicators	5	The community based organisations and the NGO develop their own indicators for the objectives they set themselves. These are then maintained.
"Proving"	2	The qualitative data are helpful for project management. Cross-checking and comparing of the CBO's and the NGO's monitoring is in-built. The limitation is that the assessment is only verified internally, unless an external evaluation takes place.
"Improving"	5	This is a main characteristic: the CBO and NGO are guided to reflect how they can improve, and to start a dialogue on it.
Local participation	5	The local participation of the CBO is a main feature of PIM, in partnership with the NGO.
Aggregation	1	Mainly for the quantitative indicators; across groups this is only possible if they have the same indicators.
Disaggregation	3	This is not in-built, but can be combined easily with the reflection workshops.
Gender disaggregation	3	This is not in-built, but can be combined easily with the reflection workshops.
Use by implementing staff	5	"NGO-based impact monitoring" is designed specifically for NGO personnel.
Use by communities	5	"Group-based impact monitoring" is designed specifically for grassroots organisations.
Useable with limited literacy	1	PIM is designed specifically for grassroots organisations. However, some people need literacy skills.
Transparency and feedback	5	Transparency, feedback and reflection are main features of the participatory monitoring concept of PIM.
Sector coverage	3	PIM is applicable for all types of group or community based self-help projects.

Participatory Impact Pathways Assessment (PIPA)

Short description

PIPA is a model for illustrating changes influenced or caused by a project or political decision. The model helps visualise the expected but also unintended outcomes and impacts of development cooperation at different levels. External factors influencing the intervention or the target group, and suggestions as to why and how changes have come about, should be included in the accompanying monitoring system.

Purpose

To visualise outcomes and impacts at different intervention levels, verified by triangulation of the subjective views of different stakeholders; to identify an impact pathway in the planning phase and thus keep focussed on impact.

Origin

At least two different sources for "Impact Pathways" can be made out in the literature: Rogers et al (2000).

Scope of application

Sector: All sectors and modes of intervention of international development cooperation

Phase: Applicable during all phases: planning, beginning, the course of and end of the project cycle.

Key steps

Preparation:

» Assessment of baseline data and situation analysis.

Implementation:

» Key stakeholders discuss processes of change.
» Illustration of a pathway of change in a diagram: the x-axis displays the different intervention levels (e.g. grassroots, institutional, political) and the perceived outcomes and impacts at each level are illustrated along the y-axis. Arrows illustrate the pathway of impacts.
» IP graph (reviewed and adjusted regularly) can be used during monitoring meetings or in evaluations.

Analysis:

» Qualitative results of the regular monitoring can be included into reports as graphs or texts. Different opinions can easily be illustrated in the impact pathway graphs.
» Verification by triangulation or spot checks.

Advantages

» User-friendly
» Applicable for new partners who are not familiar with standard procedures of accountability
» Graphs can be analysed and interpreted easily
» Compatible with models for planning and impact assessment (e.g. log frame).

Limitations

» Difficulty of quantification
» Qualitative data cannot be aggregated.

Conditions needed for application

Resource implications

Time expenditure: Low

Stakeholders involved: Participative or at least consultative tool; key persons involved

Staff input: M&E expert at the start, project leaders later.

Compatibility with other tools

» Qualitative data may be complemented by quantitative data.
» The various levels of a logframe or other impact model may be transferred into the impact pathway.

Sources of support

Websites: www.ciat.cgiar.org/src/pdf/iita_bdouthwaite.pdf

More information on all aspects of PIPA at http://impactpathways.pbwiki.com

ACT-D members using it

Availability in other languages

Available in English and Spanish.

Usefulness ratings for PIPA – comments by Sophie Alvarez, CIAT

Criteria of usefulness/ appropriateness	Ratings (1 low – 5 high)	Comments by authors or other experts (available for some of the tools)
Impact as well as outcomes	3	The approach monitors outcomes and establishes hypotheses for testing in impact assessment. It makes explicit the impacts expected.
Measurement (quantitative)	3	The usual PIPA application encourages the identification of SMART milestones and indicators – specific, measurable (i.e., quantifiable), attributable, realistic and time-bound.
Description (qualitative)	3	PIPA identifies qualitative changes in knowledge, attitude and skills.
Attribution of change	3	PIPA begins with exploring cause-effect relationships, but it is also actor-oriented and philosophically prefers to think about contribution rather than attribution.
Independent of baselines	4	PIPA copes well – it can start (and usually does) without much baseline data. PIPA does construct benchmarks of stakeholder relationships before the project starts, early expectations, and what stakeholders believe will happen without the intervention.
Independent of indicators	4	PIPA develops indicators.
"Proving"	3	By benchmarking stakeholders' expectations of changes that the project will bring about, and how they think this will happen, PIPA provides a solid foundation for an evaluator who subsequently wishes to make a case that the project contributed, and how. Philosophically, though, PIPA sees innovation emerging out of the interactions of multiple actors and does not attempt linear attribution of impact to one actor or another.
"Improving"	5	(Very good for this). Regular reflection of projects' progress along their impact pathways is the cornerstone of PIPA.
Local participation	5	(As much as logistically and financially possible is the premise).
Aggregation	2	PIPA pushes participants to identify changes projects are attempting to achieve at aggregate level. A bolt-on to PIPA is extrapolation domain analysis that looks at the potential for adoption of project outputs beyond the pilot sites in which they were developed.
Disaggregation	4	For being actor based, each change is described in terms of WHO it is happening to. This allows for lots of disaggregation.
Gender disaggregation	4	Where it makes sense we ask participants to disaggregate the likely effects of their projects. PIPA has been developed together with gender experts.
Use by implementing staff	5	Very appropriate.
Use by communities	4	Most of it is – some parts of a complete version of PIPA might be challenging, related to the next point – literacy.
Useable with limited literacy	3	Not very. Some parts, like the networks, are very intuitive, but others, like M&E, and Gantt charts, etc., are not.
Transparency and feedback	4	Very well. It is central to PIPA.
Sector coverage	4	The method has been mainly used in R4D projects, and mostly water, agriculture and related sectors. It has also been used for KM projects, and it can be well adapted to almost any kind of project.

Participatory Livelihood Monitoring (PaLSA)

Short description

PaLSA is a qualitative and participative approach designed to uncover cross-linked outcome and impact structures. The approach combines PRA tools with elements of MAPP and of the DFID Livelihood Approach.

Purpose

To study outcomes and impacts – intended and unexpected, direct and indirect, easily attributable and hard to attribute – and to throw light on complex relationships of factors and influences.

Origin

PaLSA is based on Systems Analysis and on the MAPP approach of Susanne Neubert.

Scope of application

Sector: Rural development, livelihood projects (poverty reduction); also suitable in relation to conflict resolution.

Phase: At any point in the project cycle – project identification, planning, monitoring and evaluation.

Key steps involved in using it

Phase of implementation

- Sequence of four participative instruments implemented with the target group at community level to assess the factors that most deeply determine the situation of the target groups and the connection between these factors. The factors are classified into the five dimensions of the Livelihood Approach and crucial ones are identified (those easily influenced by the project and those expected to induce a positive change on the total system).
- Combination of participative tools at community level and first analysis: assessment of the outcome and impact of selected activities on the crucial livelihood factors and a simple cross-check of the results. Analysis and documentation of the results according to a predetermined pattern.

Phase of analysis

- Aggregation of the results (if the project was implemented at several locations) and production of a portfolio on effectiveness (average change in crucial livelihood factors after beginning of specific activity) and efficiency (average influence of activity on crucial livelihood factors) for the various activities. The data is analysed with the help of predetermined Excel sheets
- Examination of the performance of different activities and assessment of causes; and implications for learning.

Advantages

- Attributes impacts to project activities
- Transparent and simple to implement and document
- Participative
- Promotes capacity building
- Appropriate for complex situations
- Manipulation of results is difficult.

Limitations

- Facilitation and moderation skills needed
- Group composition is critical (gender, age, etc.)
- Implementation is difficult for illiterate groups
- Memories of target groups may be distorted
- Failure, initially, to consider negative impacts; though these can easily be included.

Conditions needed for application

Resource implications

Time expenditure: Half a day initial workshop for each location plus 4 hours of evaluation when used for planning or monitoring; monitoring component should be repeated once or twice a year.

Stakeholders involved: Participative approach.

Staff input: Moderation is necessary – two persons for groups over 15 participants. Facilitators should be trained in advance (c. 2-3 days); they should have language skills or use translation.

Compatibility with other tools

May be complemented by objective indicators.

Sources of support

Website: ftp://ftp.fao.org/docrep/fao/009/ah455e/ah455e00.pdf

Bibliography: Strele et al. (2006): Linking Programmes and Poor People's Interests to Politics Experiences from Cambodia, FAO Livelihood Support Programme.

ACT-D members using it

Availability in other languages

Available in English only.

Usefulness ratings for Participatory Livelihood Monitoring (PaLSA)

Criteria of usefulness/ appropriateness	**Ratings** (1 low – 5 high)	**Comments by authors or other experts** (available for some of the tools)
Impact as well as outcomes	4	
Measurement (quantitative)	2	
Description (qualitative)	5	
Attribution of change	5	
Independent of baselines	5	
Independent of indicators	2	
“Proving”	3	
“Improving”	5	
Local participation	4	
Aggregation	5	
Disaggregation	2	
Gender disaggregation	2	
Use by implementing staff	5	
Use by communities	5	
Useable with limited literacy	2	
Transparency and feedback	3	
Sector coverage	3	

Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment (PCIA)

Short description

The PCIA debate has developed in many different directions, so it is difficult to describe the current state of play. PCIA is a set of interpretive tools used to anticipate (ex ante) and to evaluate (ex post) the impacts of proposed and completed development projects on structures and processes that strengthen peaceful coexistence and decrease the likelihood of the outbreak, reoccurrence or continuation of violent conflict.

Purpose

To ensure that outside actors are conflict-sensitive and to examine the relevance of their intervention to the promotion of peace. Relevant outcomes and impacts are considered – expected or unintended, direct or indirect.

Origin

In 1996, Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) asked Kenneth Bush to develop a discussion paper for the OECD-DAC Working Group on Conflict, Peace and Development Cooperation. The IDRC Evaluation Unit supported fieldwork on PCIA in Mozambique, Uganda and South Africa in 1997. The second phase of PCIA (1999-2003/04) saw the development and introduction of a variety of different conflict-sensitive analytical tools, mainly inspired by peace research, into development cooperation. The third phase of PCIA started in 2003/4.

Scope of application

Sector: Interventions designed to influence conflicts or taking place in conflict regions

Context: Less applicable for small NGO projects

Phase: Usually ex post, but possible in all phases (inclusion into the project cycle is recommended).

Key steps involved in using it

Phase of preparation

Assessing the dynamics of the conflict environment and the peace building needs (analysis of the context and situation, community profile, conflict profile, peace profile, stakeholder profile, assessment of responsibilities and underlying causes, scenarios and objectives, specification of need for peace building) - use of impact hypotheses with indicators and impact chains.

Phase of implementation

- Impact Assessment (Political, Economic, Social, Cultural, Security impact)
- Assessing the peace building relevance of an intervention (comparison between goals and activities on the one hand and the identified need on the other hand; lessons learned)
- Assessing the possible effects / risks of the conflict on the intervention (check lists on security, political climate, relations with partners and stakeholders, relationship to parties in conflict; distinction into regions possible).

Phase of analysis

Assessing the conflict and peace building effects of an intervention (use of impact hypotheses; baseline and monitoring data; comparison between baseline and current situation; joint evaluation).

Advantages

- Based on objective and subjective data
- Adjustable for different contexts
- Promotes ownership of target groups and stakeholders for the project
- Promotes sensibility about the conflict
- Promotes conflict resolution.

Limitations

- Alternative causes for the changes are not explicitly ruled out
- Remains vague: Very few specific guidelines for impact analysis
- Tendency to focus on too many fields and levels of observation
- Tool should be included in the project cycle in order to be efficient.

Conditions needed for application

Resource implications

Time expenditure: High; at least 2 days when first used; less time when included into monitoring; PCIA should be implemented 2-12 times a year depending on the situation.

Stakeholders involved: Depends on the mode of implementation; may be internal or external.

Compatibility with other tools

Do No Harm.

Sources of support

Website: http://cpr.web.cern.ch/cpr/library/Tools/PCIA_HandbookEn_v2.2.pdf

ACT-D members using it

Availability in other languages

Available in English only.

Usefulness ratings for Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment (PCIA)

Criteria of usefulness/ appropriateness	**Ratings** (1 low – 5 high)	**Comments by authors or other experts** (available for some of the tools)
Impact as well as outcomes	5	
Measurement (quantitative)	1	
Description (qualitative)	5	
Attribution of change	5	
Independent of baselines	2	
Independent of indicators	4	
"Proving"	3	
"Improving"	5	
Local participation	2	
Aggregation	1	
Disaggregation	1	
Gender disaggregation	1	
Use by implementing staff	3	
Use by communities	1	
Useable with limited literacy	1	
Transparency and feedback	3	
Sector coverage	2	

Poverty Impact Assessment (PIA)

Short description

PIA, a light version of PSIA, is an internationally accepted approach usually used for ex ante assessment. The future poverty impacts as well as their causes are assessed. PIA is based on subjective views, existing monitoring data, relevant studies and literature. When analysing (expected or possible) outcomes and impacts, the information source is documented, with an indication of its quality or of the reliability of the information.

Purpose

To assess the impact of an intervention on the poverty levels of different social groups and to identify the relevant poverty impact chains. PIA considers outcomes and impacts, whether direct or indirect, whether intended or unintended, whether positive or negative; with both qualitative and quantitative assessment.

Origin

Developed in 2006/7 by different donors of the OECD / DAC as a means of harmonisation.

Scope of application

Sector: Developed for all sectors

Context: PIA was developed for projects whereas PSIA was developed for policy reforms

Phase: Developed for ex ante assessments, but also applicable for ex post evaluation.

Key steps involved in using it

Phase of preparation

Phase of implementation

- » Assessment of the poverty situation in the country/region/ sector and of potential support for the strategies of the implementing organisation
- » Analysis of stakeholders and institutions
- » Assessment of transmission channels
- » Assessment of impacts on the poverty reduction capabilities of the participants, especially of the target groups, taking into account the five dimensions of poverty
- » Assessment of impacts on the MDGs and other national or international goals.

Phase of analysis

Results are documented in tables and highlighted optically (colours, symbols etc.) which are complemented by more detailed descriptions.

Advantages

- » Offers relatively simple but effective and flexible methodology
- » Is attractive for partners as it was developed by several donor agencies
- » Uncovers implicit intervention design, and can expose reasons for donor actions
- » Can be the basis for a harmonised reporting system
- » Can identify interventions with high impact on poverty and on pro-poor growth
- » Documents the causal pathways between outputs/outcomes and impacts
- » Takes multi-dimensionality of poverty, MDGs, and strategic goals into account
- » Can identify significant gaps in knowledge or information.

Limitations

Is only appropriate for application at macro level, not with communities.

Conditions needed for application

Resource implications

Time: About 2 weeks

Stakeholders involved: Applicable in field studies, desk studies, PIA can be used in participative dialogues

Staff input: Can be carried out by staff or external experts.

Compatibility with other tools

PSIA, MAPP, logframe / causal chain analysis, ADB, Sustainable Livelihoods Approach, OECD DAC capabilities framework, cost-benefit / cost effectiveness analysis, environmental assessments.

Sources of support

Website: http://www.oecd.org/document/12/0,3343,en_2649_34621_36573452_1_1_1_1,00.html

Bibliography: OECD 2006: Promoting Pro-Poor Growth. Harmonising Ex Ante Poverty Impact Assessment.

ACT-D members using it

Availability in other languages

Available in English, French and Spanish.

Usefulness ratings for Poverty Impact Assessment (PIA)

Criteria of usefulness/ appropriateness	**Ratings** (1 low – 5 high)	**Comments by authors or other experts** (available for some of the tools)
Impact as well as outcomes	5	
Measurement (quantitative)	4	
Description (qualitative)	4	
Attribution of change	4	
Independent of baselines	1	
Independent of indicators	2	
"Proving"	3	
"Improving"	3	
Local participation	1	
Aggregation	1	
Disaggregation	1	
Gender disaggregation	2	
Use by implementing staff	2	
Use by communities	1	
Useable with limited literacy	1	
Transparency and feedback	3	
Sector coverage	3	

'Project-Out / Context-In' Approach

Short description

In this approach, impact measurement/assessment is made from two perspectives:

Project-out – starting with the aim of a project, seeks ways of assessing achievements against this from a variety of perspectives (e.g. for an empowerment project, looks at the intervention and at the changes that occurred in domestic or local power relations as a consequence).

Context-in – starting with changes happening in people's lives, asks what is significant about these, and then assesses the effects of an intervention in relation to them.

Purpose

The purpose of this approach is to assess what organisations were trying to achieve compared to changes experienced by people, and to understand why the two might be different.

Origin

Used in 2000-01 by Community Aid Abroad, Australia.

Scope of application

Sector: Suitable for community-based interventions

Phase: Developed for ex post impact assessment.

Key steps involved in using it

Phase of preparation

- Study of national and regional factors influencing development so as to understand change at different levels
- Consideration of what the project has achieved in relation to its aim ('Project-out').

Phase of implementation ('Context-in')

Meetings with stakeholders – community groups, staff, partner NGO committees, other NGO, government officials, experts etc – asking two key questions:

- What changes have been experienced by people – have lives improved?
- How the project has or has not contributed to those changes – did our work make a difference?

Phase of analysis

- Statistical test to identify significant factors for development / empowerment; comparing this with the perspectives of beneficiaries.
- Analysis of reasons why the two perspectives may be different.

Advantages

- Focus beyond the outcomes of projects
- Holistic view by comparing project's and beneficiaries' perspectives.

Conditions needed for application

Resource implications

Stakeholders involved: Community groups, staff, partner NGO, other NGOs, government officials, experts

Compatibility with other tools

Sources of support

Website: http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/routledg/cdip/2004/00000014/00000005/art00010

Bibliography: Kelly et al, Impact measurement for NGOs: experiences from India and Sri Lanka, Development in Practice, Vol 14, No 5, August 2004.

ACT-D members using it

Availability in other languages

Usefulness ratings for 'Project-Out / Context-In' Approach

Criteria of usefulness/ appropriateness	**Ratings** (1 low – 5 high)	**Comments by authors or other experts** (available for some of the tools)
Impact as well as outcomes	5	
Measurement (quantitative)	2	
Description (qualitative)	4	
Attribution of change	4	
Independent of baselines	4	
Independent of indicators	4	
"Proving"	4	
"Improving"	3	
Local participation	4	
Aggregation	2	
Disaggregation	3	
Gender disaggregation	4	
Use by implementing staff	1	
Use by communities	1	
Useable with limited literacy	1	
Transparency and feedback	3	
Sector coverage	5	

Rigorous Impact Analysis (RIA)

Short description

Rigorous Impact Analysis is a statistical tool of impact assessment, using comparison with a control group to test predetermined hypotheses. It seeks to identify causal relationships between the intervention and detected changes, and the extent to which the intervention contributes to the changes. The quality of RIA depends on the quality of the control group, generated by randomised or quasi-experimental tools.

Purpose

To test cause-effect hypotheses, distinguishing between the outcomes/impacts of the intervention and changes caused by other external factors.

Origin

Scope of application

Sector: Scope of application generally not limited – main restriction is generation of an adequate control group.

Phase: It is necessary to specify in advance two times at which measurements will be taken.

Key steps involved in using it

Phase of preparation

- Define the hypotheses to be tested
- Identify the control group

Phase of implementation

- Collect the relevant data (usually with standardised interview or questionnaire)

Phase of analysis

- Analyse the data statistically
- Interpret the results
- Identify possible causes as independent variables and analyse their influence on the measured outcome/ impacts (significance)
- Use triangulation to cross check.

Advantages

Results are transparent (for experts).

Limitations

- The procedure can only be carried out by statisticians
- It is difficult to identify an adequate control group
- If the hypotheses are not valid, findings may be distorted.

Conditions needed for application

Existence of a control group is prerequisite.

Resource implications

Time: Up to two years

Stakeholders involved: Target groups as interviewees, staff (perhaps) as interviewers

Staff input: Staff may have role in implementation, but outside statistics experts are probably needed.

Compatibility with other tools

Triangulation with qualitative tools is possible.

Sources of support

Website: http://www.iadb.org/ove/Documents/uploads/cache/599401.pdf

ACT-D members using it

Availability in other languages

Available in English only.

Usefulness ratings for Rigorous Impact Analysis (RIA)

Criteria of usefulness/ appropriateness	**Ratings** (1 low – 5 high)	**Comments by authors or other experts** (available for some of the tools)
Impact as well as outcomes	5	
Measurement (quantitative)	5	
Description (qualitative)	3	
Attribution of change	4	
Independent of baselines	1	
Independent of indicators	1	
"Proving"	4	
"Improving"	2	
Local participation	1	
Aggregation	5	
Disaggregation	5	
Gender disaggregation	5	
Use by implementing staff	2	
Use by communities	1	
Useable with limited literacy	1	
Transparency and feedback	2	
Sector coverage	2	

Situational Analysis and Goal Establishment (SAGE)

Short description

SAGE is a tool for use by a community-based group with some initial facilitation. It assumes that local people, knowing their situation and aspirations, are best placed to set goals. Periodic self-assessments explore how far the targets are being met for each member or household and so track the changes. With options for rating the answers, the indicators may be represented quantitatively, facilitating aggregation and disaggregation of data.

Purpose

To identify the group's goals for improvement of its members' lives and to understand outcomes and impacts in terms of changes in the lives of individuals and families.

Origin

SAGE was developed from 2004 to 2007 as part of the NGO-IDEAs Toolbox (see above).

Scope of application

Sector: Developed for micro-finance sector but applicable for all sectors with group activities.

Context: Self-help promotion (community or group based projects)

Phase: Developed for monitoring during project implementation.

Key steps involved in using it

Phase of preparation

» NGO facilitator introduces SAGE at a group meeting, alerting members to the time that the exercise will take.

Phase of implementation

» Discussion in the group about members' situations before joining, their present situation, and their aspirations.
» NGO facilitator helps develop group vision through individual/family goals, with time-frame, and to convert the goals into indicators; later raises questions about changes (positive and negative) and how/why they happened.
» Group members assess where each stands in regard to each of the goals; this is documented, and each member gets a card stating her/his present position in terms of the indicators; application repeated once a year.
» The NGO can also carry out the exercise for a control group, not involved in or affected by the project activities.
» Specific data for gender (and other disaggregation) is obtained from some of the groups (decided earlier).

Phase of analysis: NGO analyses the results and the information about cause-effect relationships.

Advantages

» Participatory, promotes individual stakeholders' autonomy
» Monitoring focuses on the beneficiaries' objectives
» Indicators are developed out of the beneficiaries' context
» The tool supports gender and poverty disaggregation
» Supports reflection and decision making in the group.

Limitations

» SAGE does not refer to formal (logframe based) planning or monitoring (can also be seen as an advantage)
» Minimum literacy is recommended for effective recording of the results.

Conditions needed for application

» Communities/ groups need a good internal organisation (such as is common in micro-finance programmes)
» Instruction and training of NGO staff (basic knowledge, participatory models) and beneficiaries.
» In NGO, analysis and interpretation must be learnt; computer skills helpful for aggregation and disaggregation.

Resource implications

Time: For NGO staff, 2 days training (1 if experienced in PRA); ½ day field applications. For group, 3-4 hours to set goals; ½ day each for applications – learned in 3 applications.

Stakeholders involved: Beneficiaries are enabled to analyse relevant changes and to draw conclusions.

Staff input: Field workers active in the community should integrate the logic into their regular work. NGO staff participate in analysis and interpretation of the results.

Compatibility with other tools

Part of NGO-IDEAs Impact Toolbox, it is compatible with PWR etc; and with PRA approaches in general.

Sources of support

Website: www.ngo-ideas.net

Bibliography: The Impact Toolbox, Version 1.1, 2007. Ed.: NGO-IDEAs; Cochin, India.

ACT-D members using it

India: Partners of Bread for the World and EED.

Availability in other languages

Available in English only.

Usefulness ratings for SAGE – comments by E. K. Santha, development consultant

Criteria of usefulness/ appropriateness	**Ratings** (1 low – 5 high)	**Comments by authors or other experts** (available for some of the tools)
Impact as well as outcomes	4	
Measurement (quantitative)	5	
Description (qualitative)	4	In SAGE, if we apply the gradual indicators, we will get better qualitative results. The provision is there in the toolbox; but applications are not done so far.
Attribution of change	4	SAGE itself cannot give data on Attribution of changes; but this can be easily done by analysing the SAGE results (Yes or No model) with the tool cause effect- relationship.
Independent of baselines	1	Without baseline data it will be difficult to attribute the changes to various actors or to find the outcome of the intervention of the NGO. A baseline is highly recommended for accurate results, it can be reconstructed.
Independent of indicators	5	SAGE is, principally, against the pre-determined indicators. However, once the SHG individual members evolve the indicators for them to be monitored individually, this is one way predetermined by them for next five or six years.
"Proving"	5	To a great extent this will provide authentic data since this is a tool for individual members to assess themselves and set goals.
"Improving"	5	It proves the status of the individual members stand and where do they want to be (improving) in term of personal, socio-cultural, economic and political area and changes can be monitored year after year. This builds capacity of the applicants of this tool.
Local participation	4	It depends on largely on the application of the tool. The facilitators have a big role to play initially to make the tool participatory which empowers the rural people.
Aggregation	5	Very effective.
Disaggregation	4	Outcome of SAGE can be combined with Participatory Wealth Ranking (PWR) and allows for poverty disaggregation.
Gender disaggregation	3	SAGE + Gender disaggregated data tool can bring the result.
Use by implementing staff	4	Proper training and orientation is needed.
Use by communities	4	Proper training and orientation is needed.
Useable with limited literacy	2	At present there is no pictorial illustration in SAGE, hence the illiterate people have to depend up on the literate one for the documentation of the tool. Illustration can solve this problem.
Transparency and feedback	3	This is new culture to be developed. Feedback system is very poor with the organisations. In PANgo, there is provision for feedback but this has to be emphasised.
Sector coverage	4	Any sector which has something to do with the CBOs. Adaptation has to be done according to the sector.

Social Framework

Short description

Social Framework describes an intended process of change as a series of events taking place across a sequence of rows and columns, starting at the bottom and going upwards. The Social Framework differs from the Logical Framework in emphasising the development actors and their relationships with each other as the main elements. The framework can be used to show one or more pathways through a network, recognising the complex contexts in which most development projects take place. Each row provides a textual description of project intentions as they apply to a specific actor in the pathway. A social framework can provide a simplified linear perspective on the more complex descriptions of reality in network models (in diagram or matrix form).

Purpose

To summarise the theory of change in a development project and describe an expected pathway of influence through a wider network of people, groups or organizations and their relationships.

Origin

Rick Davies, 2008.

Scope of application

Sector: All sectors

Context: Applicable in different cultural contexts

Phase: Recommended for monitoring and evaluation.

Key steps involved in using it

Phase of preparation:

Phase of implementation:

Phase of analysis:

Advantages

There are change objectives for all actors in the pathway. All actors have to take responsibility in order to make the framework function as intended.

Limitations

Generally, the vertical axis in logical models represents time. That makes it difficult to think about a logical model in which time is not the primary vertical dimension, but instead it is social distance (in degrees).

Conditions needed for application

Resource implications

Stakeholders involved: Participatory process recommended.

Compatibility with other tools

Outcome Mapping. Social Frameworks are related to Network Models and Frameworks. A Modular Matrix Approach is useful to represent and evaluate complex programs.

Sources of support

Website: http://mande.co.uk/2008/topic-bibliographies/networksanalysisandevaluation/the-social-framework-as-an-alternative-to-the-logical-framework/

ACT-D members using it

Availability in other languages

Available in English only.

Usefulness ratings for Social Framework

Criteria of usefulness/ appropriateness	**Ratings** (1 low – 5 high)	**Comments by authors or other experts** (available for some of the tools)
Impact as well as outcomes	3	
Measurement (quantitative)	4	
Description (qualitative)	1	
Attribution of change	4	
Independent of baselines	2	
Independent of indicators	2	
"Proving"	2	
"Improving"	2	
Local participation	2	
Aggregation	4	
Disaggregation	5	
Gender disaggregation	1	
Use by implementing staff	3	
Use by communities	1	
Useable with limited literacy	1	
Transparency and feedback	2	
Sector coverage	5	

Sustainability Impact Assessment (SIA)

Short description
The SIA process includes a wide range of tools to account for different aspects of sustainable development – economic, environmental and social. Grades of sustainability allow direct comparisons between projects.

Purpose
To assess and to promote economic, environmental and social sustainability.

Origin
Many actors have contributed to the construction of an SIA framework. Reports about SIAs have been published by OECD, UNEP, WWF, FFLA, EU and others.

Scope of application
Sector: Economic, ecologic and social sectors
Context: Applicable especially in large-scaled projects, applied in various countries
Phase: SIA should be introduced as early as possible (always ex ante).

Key steps involved in using it
- Screening (determination of the measures requiring SIA)
- Scoping (establishment of the appropriate coverage of each SIA)
- Preliminary Sustainability Assessment (identification of potentially significant effects, positive and negative, on sustainable development)
- Mitigation and enhancement analysis (suggestion of types of improvements which may enhance the overall impact on sustainable development).

Advantages
- Makes sustainability measurable and comparable.

Limitations
- Time consuming
- Designed for large-scale projects.

Conditions needed for application

Resource implications
Time expenditure: Very high. SIAs can last months or years, so SIA should be understood as an ongoing and large-scale process of assessment.

Stakeholders involved: Target groups are not necessarily involved.

Staff input: Many 'SIA experts' need to be involved during the whole process; knowledge about SIA is to be transmitted in complex workshops.

Compatibility with other tools
Different tools can be integrated in SIA, such as descriptive tools and consultative and participative tools.

Sources of support
Websites: http://europa.eu.int/comm/trade/pdf/repwto.pdf

http://www.ecologic.de/download/projekte/1800-1849/1800/6_1800_cate_sia.pdf

ACT-D members using it

Availability in other languages
Available in English only.

Usefulness ratings for Sustainability Impact Assessment (SIA)

Criteria of usefulness/ appropriateness	**Ratings** (1 low – 5 high)	**Comments by authors or other experts** (available for some of the tools)
Impact as well as outcomes	5	
Measurement (quantitative)	5	
Description (qualitative)	3	
Attribution of change	2	
Independent of baselines	2	
Independent of indicators	2	
“Proving”	5	
“Improving”	2	
Local participation	1	
Aggregation	3	
Disaggregation	3	
Gender disaggregation	1	
Use by implementing staff	1	
Use by communities	1	
Useable with limited literacy	1	
Transparency and feedback	1	
Sector coverage	4	

Theory of Change (ToC)

Short description

The tool views projects as interrelated sequences of hypotheses, "theories of change" (e.g. if right knowledge then right attitude and if right attitude then right practice). Evaluation involves asking to what extent the project's theory has unfolded or is unfolding (e.g. did participants who developed good knowledge also have positive changes in attitudes and did such attitudinal changes actually translate into better practice?) In this way, the hypotheses underlying the project are tested, and this may suggest adjustments to the overall theory of change leading to increased prospects for the project bringing about, or contributing to, desired change.

Purpose

To help project stakeholders to manage for desired change.

Origin

Aspen Institute.

Scope of application

Sector: Multiple

Context: Multiple

Phase: Heavy investment of effort at planning stage; revisited periodically during implementation.

Key steps involved in using it

Phase of preparation

Stakeholders define the ultimate change they want to result from the project. Through a process of "backwards mapping" they then identify changes (intermediate outcomes) that are necessary for (or, at least, will significantly aid in) bringing about that ultimate change. Indicators are defined for the outcomes, so that progress towards them can be tracked over time. Finally, interventions are devised to trigger the intermediate outcomes, and critical assumptions underlying all the linkages in the project's theory of change are articulated.

Phase of implementation

Data are collected on the outcome indicators – at the start and periodically thereafter.

Phase of analysis

Data on the outcome indicators make possible periodic examination of the extent to which the project's theory has unfolded. Where changes have not occurred as expected, reasons for this can be explored. This could result in modifying the theory of change and/or in strengthening implementation.

Advantages

» Helps to focus interventions strategically, on "leverage points" for change.
» Facilitates ownership of project by stakeholders.
» Supports and promotes managing for change.

Limitations

» Demands much data collection and analysis, and the requisite capability
» Comprehensive stakeholder involvement may be difficult to ensure.
» It does not escape the "attribution dilemma".

Conditions needed for application

Resource implications

Time: Need sufficient time for developing and revising the project's theory of change and capturing and analysing data on its indicators.

Stakeholders involved: Best done with involvement of key stakeholders.

Staff input: Facilitation, questionnaire development, data collection and analysis.

Compatibility with other tools

Sources of support

Website: http://www.aspeninstitute.org/site/c.huLWJeMRKpH/b.612045/

ACT-D members using it

Availability in other languages

Available in English only.

Usefulness ratings for Theory of Change (ToC)

Criteria of usefulness/ appropriateness	**Ratings** (1 low – 5 high)	**Comments by authors or other experts** (available for some of the tools)
Impact as well as outcomes	5	
Measurement (quantitative)	5	
Description (qualitative)	5	
Attribution of change	4	
Independent of baselines	3	
Independent of indicators	4	
"Proving"	4	
"Improving"	5	
Local participation	4	
Aggregation	4	
Disaggregation	4	
Gender disaggregation	4	
Use by implementing staff	3	
Use by communities	3	
Useable with limited literacy	1	
Transparency and feedback	4	
Sector coverage	5	

»

8. Sources

Bibliography

Organisation	ActionAid International
Author	
Title	ALPS - Accountability, Learning and Planning System
Place, Year	Johannesburg, 2006
E201	www.actionaid.org/assets/pdf%5CALPSENGLISH2006FINAL_14FEB06.pdf

Organisation	ActionAid International
Author	
Title	What Makes a Critical Story of Change?
Place, Year	
E240	http://www.actionaid.org/assets/docs%5CWhat%20makes%20a%20Critical%20Story%20of%20Change%20w%20sentences.doc

Organisation	AMP (Accelerated Microenterprise Advancement Project United States Agency for International Development)
Author	
Title	Review of Poverty Assessment Tools
Place, Year	2004
E238	http://www.microlinks.org/file_download.php/Review+of+Poverty+Assessment+Tools.pdf?URL_ID=12359&filename=11549884921Review_of_Poverty_Assessment_Tools.pdf&filetype=application%2Fpdf&filesize=204543&name=Review+of+Poverty+Assessment+Tools.pdf&location=user-S/

Organisation	Australian government (AusAID)
Author	
Title	Baseline Study Guidelines
Place, Year	2003
E244	http://www.ausaid.gov.au/publications/pdf/baseline_guidelines.pdf

Organisation	Banco Mundial
Author	Baker, Judy L.
Title	Directivas de Desarrollo. Evaluación del impacto de los proyectos de desarrollo en la pobreza. Manual para profesionales
Place, Year	Washington, 2001
S202	http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTISPMA/Resources/Impact-Evaluation-Handbook--Spanish-/manual.pdf

Organisation	Banco Mundial
Author	Ravallion, Martin
Title	Evaluación de Programas Contra la Pobreza In: T. Paul Schultz and John Strauss, Handbook of Development Economics Vol. 4.
Place, Year	Amsterdam
S201	http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTISPMA/Resources/383704-1153333441931/ Evaluating_Antipoverty_Programs_Spanish.pdf

Organisation	Banco Munidal
Author	
Title	La Evaluación de Impacto y el ciclo de Proyecto
Place, Year	2006
S200	http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTISPMA/Resources/383704-1146752240884/ doing_ie_series_01_spanish.pdf

Organisation	GTZ, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit GmbH
Author	Schäfer, Birgit
Title	Guidelines for impact monitoring & assessment in microfinance programmes
Place, Year	Eschborn, 2001
E236	https://www.gtz.de/de/dokumente/en_guidelines_for_impact_monitoring_Schaefer.pdf

Organisation	Banque Mondiale
Author	Baker, Judy L.
Title	Directions du Developpement. Evaluation de l'impact des projets de Développement sur la pauvreté. Manuel à l'attention des Praticiens
Place, Year	Washington, 2000
F200	http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTISPMA/Resources/Impact-Evaluation--French-/ iehandbook_fr.pdf

Organisation	Bundesministerium für Umwelt, Naturschutz und Reaktorsicherheit
Author	
Title	Gender Impact Assessment. Checklist
Place, Year	Berlin, 2002
D200	http://www.bmu.bund.de/files/pdfs/allgemein/application/pdf/gia_checkliste.pdf

Organisation	Centre for Human and Organisational Resource Development (CHORD); Women Opportunity Fund Opportunity Network
Author	Sinapi Aba Trust, Ghana
Title	Participatory Impact Monitoring and Evaluation System (PIMES) – A Tool for Tracking Transformation Draft Report
Place, Year	
E237	http://www.microfinancegateway.org/files/3232_pimes.doc

Organisation	Centre for Social and Economic Research on the Global Environment (CSERGE)
Author	Opoku, Camilla and Andrew Jordan
Title	Impact Assessment in the EU. A Global Sustainable Development Perspective
Place, Year	Norwich, 2004
E223	http://web.fu-berlin.de/ffu/akumwelt/bc2004/download/opoku_jordan_f.pdf

Organisation	enHealth (Commonwealth Department of Health and Aged Care)
Author	
Title	Health Impact Assessment Guidelines
Place, Year	Canberra, 2001
E228	http://www.nphp.gov.au/enhealth/council/pubs/pdf/hia_guidelines.pdf

Organisation	Evaluating Development Policy of the German Evaluation Society (DeGEval)
Author	
Title	Learning from Evaluations. Guidelines for Donor Agencies and Evaluators (Working Paper 2)
Place, Year	Saarbrücken, 2005
E229	http://www.uni-saarland.de/fak5/stockmann/akepol/download/AK_WORKINGPAPER2-engl.pdf

Organisation	FriENT
Author	Spelten, Angelika
Title	Kurzeinführung: Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment
Place, Year	2006
D202	http://www.frient.de/downloads/Einfuehrung%20PCIA.pdf

Organisation	
Author	Gavin, Tertia; Pinder, Caroline
Title	Toolbox: Stakeholder Analysis. Impact Assessment and Stakeholder Analysis
Place, Year	
E231	http://www.enterprise-impact.org.uk/pdf/StakeholderAnalysis.pdf

Organisation	GTZ, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit GmbH
Author	Schäfer, Birgit
Title	Guidelines for impact monitoring & assessment in microfinance programmes
Place, Year	Eschborn, 2001
E236	https://www.gtz.de/de/dokumente/en_guidelines_for_impact_monitoring_Schaefer.pdf

Organisation	GTZ – Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit GmbH – Section 41 – Economic and Employment Promotion
Author	Vahlhaus, Martina
Title	Guidelines for Impact Monitoring in Economic and Employment Promotion Projects with Special Referencie to Poverty Reduction Impacts Part I: Why Do Impact Monitoring? – A Guide
Place, Year	Eschborn, 2001
E235	http://portals.wdi.wur.nl/files/docs/ppme/guidelines_for_impact_monitoring_I_2001.pdf

Organisation	GTZ – Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit GmbH – Section 41 – Economic and Employment Promotion
Author	Vahlhaus, Martina
Title	Guidelines for Impact Monitoring in Economic and Employment Promotion Projects with Special Referencie to Poverty Reduction Impacts Part II: How to introduce and carry out Impact Monitoring – Tips, Methods and Instruments
Place, Year	Eschborn, 2001
E234	http://portals.wdi.wur.nl/files/docs/ppme/guidelines_for_impact_monitoring_II_2001.pdf

Organisation	Humanitarian Policy Group (HPG)
Author	Hofmann, Charles-Antoine; Les Roberts, Jeremy Shoham and Paul Harvey
Title	HPG Report 17. Measuring the Impact of Humanitarian Aid. A Review of Current Practice
Place, Year	London, 2004
E215	http://www.odi.org.uk/hpg/papers/HPGReport17.pdf

Organisation	Institute of Development Studies (IDS)
Author	Guijt, Irene
Title	Critical Readings on Assessing and Learning for Social Change. A Review. Development Bibliography 21
Place, Year	Brighton, 2008
E222	http://www.ids.ac.uk/ids/bookshop/db/db21.pdf

Organisation	International Association for Impact Assessment (IAIA)
Author	André, Pierre et al.
Title	IAIA Special Publication Series No. 4. Public Participation. International Best Practice Principles
Place, Year	Fargo, 2006
E219	http://www.iaia.org/modx/assets/files/SP4%20web.pdf

Organisation	International Association for Impact Assessment (IAIA)
Author	Vanclay, Prof. Frank
Title	Social Impact Assessment. International Principles
Place, Year	Fargo, 2003
E221	http://www.iaia.org/modx/assets/files/SP2.pdf

Organisation	International Water Management Institute (IWMI)
Author	Chandrapatya, Dr. Suraphol
Title	Concepts and Principles of RRA/PRA/PLA
Place, Year	
E218	http://pimd.iwmi.org/Library/pdf/PPT%20-%203%20Participatory%20Research %20 &%20Development%20for%20Sustainable%20Irrigation%20Mgmt%20SC.ppt

Organisation	INTRAC
Author	Giffen, Janice
Title	Impact Assessment: A Tool for Evidence-Based Programming or for Self-Marketing?
Place, Year	2005
E232	http://www.intrac.org/resources_database.php?id=165

Organisation	
Author	Jacob, Klaus; Julia Hertin; Peter Hjerp et al.
Title	Improving the Practice of Impact Assessment
Place, Year	2008
E226	http://web.fu-berlin.de/ffu/evia/EVIA_Policy_Paper.pdf

Organisation	
Author	Kirkpatrick, C. & D. Hulme
Title	Basic Impact Assessment at Project Level
Place, Year	2002
E233	http://www.enterprise-impact.org.uk/word-files/CoreText2.doc

Organisation	
Author	Maleh, Carole
Title	Appreciative Inquiry: Aus Erfolgen lernen In: ManagerSeminare, Heft 44/2000, 90-95.
Place, Year	2000
E239	http://www.wsue.de/lit_d/managerseminare_aug_2000.html

Organisation	
Author	Mayoux, Linda
Title	What Do We Want to Know? Selecting Indicators
Place, Year	2001
E008	http:///www.enterprise-impact.org.uk/informationresources/toolbox/selectingindicators.shtml

Organisation	
Author	Mayoux, Linda
Title	Empowering Enquiry: A New Approach to Investigation
Place, Year	2003
E134	http:///www.enterprise-impact.org.uk/informationresources/toolbox/empoweringenquiry.shtml

Organisation	
Author	Mayoux, Linda; S. Mosedale; EDS
Title	Impact Assessment for Pro-Poor Accountability: Innovations and Challenges In: Journal of International Development (March).
Place, Year	2005
E245	http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/cgi-bin/abstract/109931322/ABSTRACT?CRETRY=1&SRETRY=0

Organisation	
Author	Mayoux, Linda
Title	Impact Assessment of Microfinance. Towards a Sustainable Learning Process
Place, Year	2001
135	http://www.enterprise-impact.org.uk/word-files/Microfinance-ContentsandSummary.doc

Organisation	
Author	Mayoux, Linda
Title	Participatory Methods
Place, Year	2001
139	http:///www.enterprise-impact.org.uk/informationresources/toolbox/particmethods.shtml

Organisation	Research Centre for Constructive Conflict Management
Author	Hoffman, Mark
Title	Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment Methodology
Place, Year	
E225	http://www.berghof-handbook.net/articles/hoffman_handbook.pdf

Organisation	Rockefeller Foundation / Goldman Sachs Foundation
Author	
Title	Social Impact Assessment. A Discussion Among Grantmakers
Place, Year	New York City, 2003
E227	http://www.riseproject.org/Social%20Impact%20Assessment.pdf

Organisation	Social Action for Grassroots Unity and Networking (SAGUN)
Author	Tamang, Buddhi
Title	Appreciative Inquiry Approach. A Training Handbook for Development Professionals
Place, Year	Kathmandu, 1999
E200	http://appreciativeinquiry.case.edu/uploads/nepal_professional_dev_handbook_ai.pdf

Organisation	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC)
Author	de Ruijter de Wildt, Marieke; David Elliott, Rob Hitchins
Title	Comparative Approaches to Private Sector Development – A MMW Perspective. Working Paper
Place, Year	Berne, 2006
E220	http://212.47.173.113/dezaweb/ressources/resource_en_150870.pdf

Organisation	University of Hannover
Author	Waibel, Hermann
Title	Impact Assessment of Agricultural Research for Development and Poverty Reduction
Place, Year	2002
E224	http://www.ifgb.uni-hannover.de/fileadmin/EUE_files/Lehre/working_pap2006/waibel_wp02.pdf

Organisation	University of Reading (Livestock Development Group; School of Agriculture, Policy and Development)
Author	
Title	Poverty and Participation. An Analysis of Bias in Participatory Methods
Place, Year	Reading, 2003
E217	http://www.livestockdevelopment.org/adobedocs/Poverty%20and%20Participation.PDF

Organisation	UNEP (EIA Training Resource Manual)
Author	
Title	Social Impact Assessment Tools and Methods
Place, Year	2002
E245	http://www.unep.ch/etu/publications/EIA_2ed/EIA_E_top13_hd1.PDF

Organisation	University of Wisconsin-Extension
Author	Taylor-Powell, Ellen & Sara Steele
Title	Collecting Evaluation Data: Direct Observation
Place, Year	Madison, 1996
E241	

Organisation	VENRO (German Association of Development NGOs)
Author	Eberhard Gohl
Title	Checking and Learning: Impact monitoring and evaluation - a practical guide
Place, Year	Bonn, 2003
E230	www.venro.org/publikationen/archiv/Checking%20and%20learning.PDF

Organisation	World Bank
Author	Baker, Judy L.
Title	Directions in Development. Evaluating the Impact of Development Projects on Poverty. A Handbook for Practicioners
Place, Year	Washington, 2000
E214	http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTISPMA/Resources/handbook.pdf

Organisation	World Bank
Author	
Title	Conducting Quality Impact Evaluations under Budget, Time and Data Constraints
Place, Year	Washington, 2006
E203	http://lnweb18.worldbank.org/oed/oeddoclib.nsf/24cc3bb1f94ae11c85256808006a0046/757a5cc0bae22558852571770059d89c/$FILE/conduct_qual_impact.pdf

Organisation	World Bank
Author	
Title	Doing Impact Evaluation 1. Impact Evaluation and the Project Cycle
Place, Year	Washington, 2006
E202	http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTISPMA/Resources/383704-1146752240884/doing_ie_series_01.pdf

Organisation	World Bank
Author	
Title	Doing Impact Evaluation No. 3. Impact Evaluation for Slum Upgrading Interventions
Place, Year	Washington, 2006
E204	http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTISPMA/Resources/383704-1146752240884/Doing_ie_series_03.pdf
Organisation	World Bank
Author	
Title	Doing Impact Evaluation No. 4. A Guide to Water and Sanitation Sector Impact Evaluation
Place, Year	Washington, 2006
E205	http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTISPMA/Resources/383704-1146752240884/Doing_ie_series_04.pdf

Organisation	World Bank
Author	
Title	Doing Impact Evaluation No. 5. Conducting Impact Evaluation in Urban Transport
Place, Year	Washington, 2007
E206	http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTISPMA/Resources/383704-1146752240884/Doing_ie_series_05.pdf

Organisation	World Bank
Author	
Title	Doing Impact Evaluation No. 6. Data for Impact Evaluation
Place, Year	Washington, 2007
E207	http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTISPMA/Resources/383704-1146752240884/Doing_ie_series_06.pdf

Organisation	World Bank
Author	
Title	Doing Impact Evaluation No. 7. Impact Evaluation for Microfinance. Review of Methodological Issues
Place, Year	Washington, 2007
E208	http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTISPMA/Resources/383704-1146752240884/Doing_ie_series_07.pdf

Organisation	World Bank
Author	
Title	Doing Impact Evaluation No. 8. Impact Evaluation for Land Property Rights Reform
Place, Year	Washington, 2007
E209	http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTISPMA/Resources/383704-1146752240884/Doing_ie_series_08.pdf

Organisation	World Bank
Author	
Title	Doing Impact Evaluation No. 9. Methodologies to Evaluate Early Childhood Development Programs
Place, Year	Washington, 2007
E210	http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTISPMA/Resources/383704-1146752240884/Doing_ie_series_09.pdf

Organisation	World Bank
Author	
Title	Doing Impact Evaluation No. 10. Impact Evaluation for School-Based Management Reform
Place, Year	Washington, 2007
E211	http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTISPMA/Resources/383704-1146752240884/Doing_ie_series_10.pdf

Organisation	World Bank
Author	Ravallion, Martin
Title	Evaluating Anti-Poverty Programs In: T. Paul Schultz and John Strauss, Handbook of Development Economics Vol. 4.
Place, Year	Amsterdam
E212	http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTISPMA/Resources/383704-1153333441931/Evaluating_Antipoverty_Programs.pdf

Organisation	World Bank
Author	Ravallion, Martin
Title	The Mystery of the Vanishing Benefits: An Introduction to Impact Evaluation In: The World Bank Economic Review, Vol. 15., Pp. 115-140.
Place, Year	Washington, 2001
E213	http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTISPMA/Resources/383704-1130267506458/Mystery_Vanishing_Benefits.pdf

Organisation	World Bank
Author	
Title	Monitoring and Evaluation: Some Tools, Methods and Approaches
Place, Year	Washington, 2004
E216	http://lnweb18.worldbank.org/oed/oeddoclib.nsf/b57456d58aba40e585256ad400736404/a5efbb5d776b67d285256b1e0079c9a3/$FILE/MandE_tools_methods_approaches.pdf

Organisation	World Health Organisation
Author	Wismar, Matthias
Title	Health Impact Assessment. Politikberatung als Bindeglied zwischen Wissensproduktion und Entscheidungsfindung
Place, Year	Brussels, 2003
D201	http://wido.de/fileadmin/wido/downloads/pdf_ggw/GGW_4-03_25-35.pdf

Organisation	WTO – World Trade Organisation
Author	Kirkpatrick, Colin; Norman Lee; Oliver Morrissey
Title	WTO New Round. Sustainability Impact Assessment Study. Phase One Report
Place, Year	Manchester, 1999
sE242	http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/pnaby208.pdf

Web links

http://www.accion.org/default.asp

ACCION International is a US-based international non-governmental organization (NGO) with a mission to give people the tools they need to work their way out of poverty. ACCION International firmly believes that microfinance institutions have the potential to access the billions of dollars in the international financial markets to help the very poor people whom the formal financial system has traditionally left behind. ACCION's goal is to make this potential a reality and thereby bring microfinance facilities to millions of poor people. ACCION operates in the Latin American, Caribbean, and African regions, and assists its partner organization to become sustainable and expand their outreach. It also operates in the United States. Despite being an NGO, it works on the basic principle that there is not enough charitable money in the world and there never will be. Hence, ACCION's programs are designed to cover their own costs. The ACCION website is a gateway to a wealth of high-quality technical and operational information on various aspects of microfinance. It provides access to information on its partner organizations, speeches made by management and top-notch staff of ACCION, its various publications including the ACCION InSight series, one-topic bulletin that highlights ACCION's policy view points and ongoing research in the microfinance field.

http://appreciativeinquiry.case.edu/

"AI Commons" is a worldwide portal devoted to the fullest sharing of academic resources and practical tools on Appreciative Inquiry and the rapidly growing discipline of positive change.

http://www.ausaid.gov.au/ (Website of the Australian Aid Program)

The Australian government's overseas aid program is a federally funded program that aims at reducing poverty in developing countries. The Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID) manages the program. The aim of the program is to assist developing countries reduce poverty and achieve sustainable development, in line with Australia's national interests.

http://www.berghof-handbook.net/

The Berghof Handbook for Conflict Transformation is a comprehensive and cumulative website resource that provides continually updated cutting-edge knowledge, experience and lessons learned for those working in the field of transforming violent ethno-political conflict. The Handbook is published by the Berghof Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management based in Berlin, Germany.

http://www.continuousprogress.org

Website containing different tools related to the planning, evaluation and communication of advocacy. Continuous Progress Strategic Services is a consulting practice based at the Aspen Institute's Global Interdependence Initiative (GII) and can help to achieve advocacy goals through planning, messaging and evaluation. Several tools are available, among others the Advocacy Progress Planner, an online logic model for planning advocacy efforts (http://planning.continuousprogress.org/)

http://www.frient.de/materialien/leitfaden.asp?kategorie=Leitfaden (Working Group on Development and Peace)

The Working Group on Development and Peace (FriEnt) is an association of seven German governmental and non-governmental organisations, with the main objective of promoting peace building in all areas of development cooperation. To this end, FriEnt's core activities include fostering joint learning, capacity building, advice and supporting networking and co-operation of its members.

http://gsociology.icaap.org/methods/ (website on social research methods)

The International Consortium for the Advancement of Academic Publication (ICAAP) is a research and development unit within Athabasca University. ICAAP is devoted to the advancement of electronic scholarly communication. The page "Resources for Methods in Evaluation and Social Research" lists web links for FREE resources for programme evaluation and social research methods. The focus is on "how-to" do evaluation research and the methods used: surveys, focus groups, sampling, interviews, and other methods. Most of these links are to resources that can be read over the web.

www.gtz.de

GTZ is an international cooperation enterprise for sustainable development with worldwide operations. It promotes complex reforms and change processes, often working under difficult conditions. Its corporate objective is to improve people's living conditions on a sustainable basis.

http://www.iaia.org/modx/ (Special website on impact assessment)

The International Association for Impact Assessment (IAIA) is a forum for advancing innovation, development and communication of best practice in impact assessment. Its international membership promotes the development of local and global capacities for the application of environmental assessments in which sound science and full public participation provide a foundation for equitable and sustainable development.

http://www.ids.ac.uk/ (website of the Institute of Development Studies)

The Institute of Development Studies is a leading global organisation for research, teaching and communications on international development. IDS aims to challenge convention and to generate fresh ideas that foster new approaches to development policy and practice. Such problem-focused thinking requires a commitment to multidisciplinarity, not just within social sciences, but across research, teaching and communications.

http://www.ifad.org/evaluation/guide/index.htm

Guide to help project managers and M&E staff to improve the quality of M&E in IFAD-supported projects. The focus of the guide is on how M&E can support project management and engage project stakeholders in understanding project progress, learning from achievements and problems, and agreeing on hoe to improve both strategy and operations. The main functions of M&E are: ensuring improvement-oriented critical reflection, learning to maximise the impact of rural development projects, and showing this impact to be accountable.

http://www.iied.org

IIED is an international policy research institute and non-governmental body working for more sustainable and equitable global development.

http://www.imp-act.org/

Imp-Act is a three-year action-research programme from the Ford Foundation implemented by three British universities and designed to improve the quality of microfinance services and their impact on poverty through strengthening the development of impact assessment systems. Interesting site. Do not miss the sections on State of the Art and Publications.

http://www.impactalliance.org/ev_en.php

The Impact Alliance is a global action network committed to strengthening the capacity of individuals and organisations to generate deep impact within the communities they serve. We do this through assisting our members to improve the quality, scale and social impact of their services and programs. The concept of the Alliance is simple:

» Link organisations looking for high quality capacity building services with organisations or individuals capable of delivering those services, and
» Stimulate new standards of innovation, excellence and effectiveness in the capacity building field.

http://www.intrac.org

» INTRAC is a non-profit organisation working in the international development and relief sector. By helping to explore policy issues, and by strengthening management and organisational effectiveness, non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and civil society organisations (CSOs) around the world are supported.

http://mande.co.uk/2008/topic-bibliographies/advocacy-and-campaigning/a-handbook-of-data-collection-tools-companion-to-%e2%80%9ca-guide-to-measuring-advocacy-and-policy%e2%80%9d/

This handbook of tools is a companion to ORS' "A Guide To Measuring Advocacy And Policy". The data collection tools included in the handbook have actually been used to evaluate advocacy or related efforts. The data collection instruments apply to six outcomes areas:

» Shifts in Social Norms;
» Strengthened Organizational Capacity;
» Strengthened Alliances;
» Strengthened Base of Support;
» Improved Policies; and
» Changes in Impact.

http://microfinancegateway.org/section/resourcecenters/impactassessment

The Impact Assessment Centre, a joint initiative of CGAP and Imp-Act, has a twofold mission:

» to promote greater understanding of the impacts of microfinance on the lives of the poor
» to encourage the use of impact assessments by microfinance providers

Contents of the Impact Assessment Centre:

» The Impacts of Microfinance
» The What, Why, and How of Impact Assessment
» Developing an Impact Assessment
» Resource Documents
» Practitioner Pages

http://www.odi.org.uk/about.html

The ODI is Britain's leading independent think tank on international development and humanitarian issues. The mission is to inspire and inform policy and practice which lead to the reduction of poverty, the alleviation of suffering and the achievement of sustainable livelihoods in developing countries.

www.outcomemapping.ca

Website of an Outcome Mapping Learning Community, including a discussion forum and resources such as examples of application. Furthermore, upcoming events related to Outcome Mapping can be found on this website.

http://portals.wi.wur.nl/ppme/

Website focused on Participatory Planning Monitoring and Evaluation (PPM&E). Objectives are:

» help build the capacity of individuals and organisations to effectively implement PPM&E systems (courses, advisory services, evaluation).
» contribute to innovation in the field of PPM&E / managing and learning for impact.
» provide practical web-based resource materials, experience sharing and learning with this PPM&E resource portal.

Main goals of the web site are (1) to provide introductions to key areas of participatory planning, monitoring and evaluation, as well as (2) to provide a quick selection of key resources in relation to specific areas of M&E work. Different tools and methods related to (1) Managing and Learning for Impact in a Project, (2) PPM&E in projects and programs, (3) Creating a Learning Environment, (4) Conflict Management, (5) Process Model, (6) Gender and PPM&E are available

http://www.worldbank.org/mdf/mdf1/poor.htm

Sustainable Banking for the Poor (SBP) is a project that aims at improving the ability of donors, governments, and practitioners to design and implement policies and programmes to build sustainable financing institutions that are effective in reaching the poor. It is carrying out a series of case studies of microfinance institutions in Asia, Africa, and Latin America that have pioneered innovative approaches for reducing the costs and risks of providing financial services to a large number of low-income clients. The case studies cover a wide range of types of institutions and programmes, including commercial banks, specialized banks, credit unions, non-governmental organisations and non-bank financial institutions.

List of abbreviations

ACT	Action by Churches Together
ADB	Asian Development Bank
ADRA	Adventist Development and Relief Agency
AI	Appreciative Inquiry
CAA	Community Aid Abroad
CBO	Community-based organizations
CEO	Chief Executive Officer
CIAT	International Centre for Tropical Agriculture
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CLM	Composite Logic Model
CSoC	Critical Stories of Change
DFID	Department For International Development (UK)
DIE	Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (German Development Institute)
DNH	Do No Harm
EED	Evangelischer Entwicklungsdienst (Church Development Service, Germany)
EU	European Union
FFLA	Fundación Futuro Latinoamericano
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
GDI	German Development Institute
IAIA	International Association for Impact Assessment
ICAAP	Internal Capital Adequacy Assessment Process
ICCO	Interchurch Organisation for Development Co-operation, Netherlands
IDPM	Institute for Development Policy and Management
IDRC	International Development Research Centre
LQAS	Lot Quality Assurance Sampling
M&E	Monitoring & Evaluation
MAPP	Method for Impact Assessment of Programmes and Projects
MDG	Millenium Development Goals
movie	Monitoring of Effects
MSC	Most Significant Changes

NGO	Non-governmental organization
NGO-IDEAs	NGO Impact on Development, Empowerment and Actions
ODI	Overseas Development Institute
OECD / DAC	Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development / Development Assistance Committee
OM	Outcome Monitoring
PAG	Performance Appraisal of the Groups
PaLSA	Participatory Livelihood Monitoring
PANgo	Performance Assessment of NGOs
PCIA	Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment
PIA	Poverty Impact Assessment
PIM	Participatory Impact Monitoring
PIPA	Participatory Impact Pathways Assessment
PLA	Participatory, Learning and Action
PME	Planning, monitoring and evaluation
PRA	Participatory Rural Appraisal
PSIA	Poverty and Social Impact Analysis
PWR	Participatory Wealth Ranking
R4D	Research for Development
RIA	Rigorous Impact Analysis
SAGE	Situational Analysis and Goal Establishment
SC	Significant Change
SHG	Self-Help Group
SIA	Sustainability Impact Assessment
SWOT	Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats
ToC	Theory of Change
ToR	Terms of Reference
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature

ACT Development
P.O. Box 2100
CH-1211 Geneva 2
Switzerland
150 route de Ferney
Grand Soconnex

+44 22 791 6211
actdevelopment@wcc-coe.org

www.actdevelopment.org