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**Introduction**

**Purpose of the Handbook**

“Managing for Results” is a handbook on Results Based Management tailored to fit the needs of Sida’s research cooperation partners. The approach in this handbook is in line with a broader view of RBM as a management tool, and is aligned with OECD/DAC terminology and practices.

The RBM Handbook provides how-to instructions that can be used by Sida-supported research partners for reference and as a complementary resource to RBM workshops.

The handbook also can be used independently as a stand-alone source for those who have not attended a RBM training workshop or seminar but are willing to embark on their own RBM initiatives.

**Content of Handbook**

After an Overview, each of the three phases of the RBM process is described: Programme Planning, Monitoring and Reporting of Programme Implementation, and Evaluation (including Self-Assessment). The handbook includes a series of exercises that allow the reader to practice and apply what is being learnt and that are followed by checklists against which the exercises can be compared and assessed.

After reading the handbook and completing the exercises, you will have a good understanding of:

- What RBM is and how it can help you
- Key concepts and terminology
- Process and sequence
- Specific phases of RBM approach
- Tools for use in applying RBM approach

**Structure**

The book is divided into 4 sections that are easy to read and understand as well as several Annexes.

**Section I: Overview**

The first section, the Overview, provides an understanding of the basics of the Results-Based Management (RBM) approach. It includes why RBM is important in research management today. The section concludes, with examples, on how RBM can be used as a management tool.

**Section II: Programme Planning**

This section introduces key RBM concepts and shows how to apply them in developing a plan for a programme. This section emphasizes the role of the RBM logical framework as an essential tool for other planning activities, citing examples. It addresses such issues as:

---

1 If at all possible, do the exercises with colleagues in the same project or programme, otherwise do them yourself.
What is the problem? What are the dimensions of the problem? What are its causes? How is the problem to be addressed and solved by the research entity?

What does it mean to identify linkages? How can you identify alternative solutions and plan towards achieving them?

What are the basic elements in RBM planning? How do you formulate objectives, outcomes, and the outputs to produce them? How do you know they are valid and how can you measure them to determine whether they can be achieved?

How can you connect outputs with outcomes?

**Section III: Monitoring and Reporting of Programme Implementation**

In RBM monitoring and reporting the primary focus is on outputs and outcomes. Monitoring progress in obtaining results is an ongoing activity and is essential to assessing whether the results you want to achieve are on course for being achieved. The section emphasizes the role of the RBM logframe as an essential tool for tracking and reporting results.

This section explains, with examples, the importance of data collection for monitoring and reporting while also showing the different sources of data and how to collect them, and gives suggestions, with examples, for annual progress reporting. It includes:

- Monitoring (Data Collection) including sources and methods of data collection
- Assessing progress
- Reporting progress on annual basis.

**Section IV: Evaluation (including Self-Assessment)**

The final section, Evaluation (including Self-Assessment), explains the role of evaluation in assessing results. It addresses such issues as: Why is it important to evaluate how you are doing? What are funding sources expecting before they continue to fund you? The role of evaluation in reassuring funding sources and in identifying lessons learned is clarified.

This section includes:

- Explanation of how to use an RBM logframe as an analytical tool to conduct self-assessment or independent evaluation of programme results over time
- Planning and designing an evaluation
- Identifying data gaps – summative (what happened) and formative (why it did or didn’t happen) information
- Reporting evaluation results
- Follow-up to Evaluation (Adjustments based on evaluation)

In each of the sections, the **RBM Handbook** includes cross-references to material in the Annex which allows more in-depth guidance for those seeking greater detail. Examples from the documents of a regional research network are included as well as from the RBM process at the global and national levels.

**Annexes** supporting the text include:

A. Glossary of terms and definitions
B. Formats and Tools, with accompanying guidance. It includes:
a) Critical questions to ask in developing an RBM Logical framework to help you get started, and
b) Examples of completed RBM Logical Framework

C. Exercises and worksheets
   a) how to build a logical framework, including a blank Logical Framework to be filled by participants,
   b) how to prepare for annual reporting, and
   c) how to prepare for a Programme Evaluation or self-assessment.

Let’s begin
Section I: Overview
Results-Based Management

What is Results-Based Management?

Public institutions - whether at the local, national or international level - are established to help solve problems that cannot be solved by the magic of the marketplace. These organizations are judged not by what they do, but by what they make happen. In short, they are accountable for results.

Since 1975, Sweden has undertaken research cooperation to support the development of low income countries. In 2008, Sida instituted RBM in all funded research cooperation programmes allowing it to demonstrate more clearly that Swedish supported research cooperation provides “opportunities for utilizing research as a tool for development”.

Results-Based Management (RBM) is an approach that focuses on the end results (outcomes) and thereby corrects the fundamental flaw of poorly defined results in programme planning. Starting with the target population and asking questions – such as “to what end?”, “what change do we want to see?” and “how we will know and show we have achieved the outcomes we set out to achieve?” – RBM focuses on the entire programme management cycle.

Thus, RBM involves three stages:

I. Programme Planning: where an organization makes promises about the results it will achieve if it is given funding.

II. Programme Monitoring and Reporting: where the organization produces the output that should make the outcomes (changes) happen.

III. Programme Evaluation: where the organization demonstrates its results and learns from the experience.

By clearly defining the expected results, collecting information on progress towards obtaining those results on a regular basis, determining whether results are making a difference over time, and taking timely corrective action, RBM enables managers to focus on and deliver the right results. Involving stakeholders in the process of results definition and their measurement ensures their buy-in for getting the desired results right at the outset.

Results-Based Management places priority on achieving results, shifting the focus from activities and outputs (what the programme or project did and produces) to outcomes (what the outputs make happen).

---

2 Sida has supported workshops and other platforms for helping its research partners apply RBM to planning, producing and using RBM as a tool for programme management as well as accountability. This handbook is based on the experience of those on-going efforts.


4 The terms used here all are in conformity with OECD/DAC standards. See the Basic Definitions of Key Terms at the end of Section II.
What do you need to do to manage based on results?
The RBM approach involves the following:

- Defining realistic expected results

The results you define for yourself and aim and expect to achieve must be realistic and within the competence of your organization. Therefore they must be based on appropriate analysis.

In order to establish realistic expected results, you need to have a firm understanding of both the problem, and of the context in which it exists.

The work you do is complex and takes place in multifaceted, living societies. Good development is based on sound analysis of political, socio-economic, gender, cultural, ethnic factors in order to understand the complex nature of the development issue, and to choose realistic expected outcomes that are relevant to the situation and that can also be achieved at least in part through your organization’s work. To be able to influence change, you need to understand how all the different elements, groups, and players fit together. It is useful to start with formulating a summary problem statement that is based on a situational analysis such as the problem tree analysis. We will come to that in section II.
You must also be able to

- **Clearly identify the target group & programme beneficiaries**
  This also goes back to Analysis. Proper analysis helps to identify the groups and individuals - the stakeholders, including target group, beneficiaries and intermediaries - that you should target or with whom you need to work.

- **Monitor progress towards results and resources consumed**
  For this it is important to use appropriate *indicators*. You must choose sound indicators that will show progress towards results achieved and permit making adjustments when and where required during the life of the programme.\(^5\)

- **Identify and manage risks**
  What factors outside your control could impact whether your resources produce what is expected?

  Before you begin a programme, it is important to identify what may go wrong, or what may come in the way of achieving the results you want. These are your *risks* and once they are identified, you can plan your programme to avoid or deal with them, and also develop risk-response strategies to cope if the event occurs.

  This is also part of analysis. As you are exploring the context of your development issue, you will identify both positives and negatives that could impact your programme and develop responses to them.

  Remember that risk management is also about opportunities as well. Are there individuals or groups that would have a stake in hindering your programme? How will you address that? Conversely, are there individuals or groups who could be potential champions? How will you plan to leverage that?

- **Organizational learning**
  You can incorporate lessons learned into your ongoing investment and into future programming. This can be within one programme, from planning cycle to planning cycle, within a culture or country, within a sector, or between different countries that share a similar development context.

- **Report on results and resources**
  Report on results achieved. People often think of reporting first when they think of RBM, but it is actually just one portion, and a portion that becomes very straight-forward and easy if you have done all the rest. Describing risks that occurred and were responded to, and changes in the situation, provide the context for your results story. But the bottom-line is always the outcomes attained to “what end” and that’s what reporting should focus on.

  Keep in mind that Results-Based Management is *both* a management tool and an accountability tool.

---

\(^5\) The word programme is used in a more general inclusive sense to include projects, programme or thematic endeavors which others often call interventions or investments.
**Evaluate results**
Evaluating or assessing the programme over time to determine whether the intended results (outcomes) are happening and the reasons why (or why not) is essential in understanding whether the programme provides “opportunities for utilizing research as a tool for development” as well as lessons learned to adjust it in the future. This phase of RBM has an element of both programme management and an element of accountability to the donors.

**Why is RBM Important?**
RBM helps you to:

- Clarify your thinking and get a better focus on why your programme is valuable
- Manage Programmes (management)
- Plan better and measure results

“What gets measured gets done”. If you don’t have measureable results, you can’t tell success from failure. It helps

- Detect and correct problems during implementation

You are prepared to devise corrective measures to tackle problems as they arise.

- Achieve results
- Learn lessons for future programming

RBM helps you to learn from success and failure.

- Make reporting credible (accountability)
- Demonstrate results for stakeholder support

**Funding Considerations**
RBM in your programme is not just for funders. While you could just say, “The funding organization wants it, so I will do it.” That’s ok, but it is not good enough. There’s more to it in the long run. RBM helps you to “state your case” in a way to:

- Prove the contribution of your programme to all stakeholders
- Eliminate any argument that funds are not well-spent
- Increase funding opportunities

**Using RBM as a Management tool**
RBM helps you to:

- Gain approval of application and funding
  - Engaging stakeholders and donors on a participatory basis
  - Gain the approval of your Governing Board and Technical Advisory Committee
- Focus on and manage programmes (management)
  - Develop an operational workplan for the year
  - Detect and correct problems during implementation
  - Learn lessons for future programming
- Make reporting credible (accountability)
  - Track results and report progress
  - Prepare Annual Report and joint annual reviews
- Establish framework for Evaluation/Self-Assessment
  - Provide accountability to donors and stakeholders

Examples of how RBM is used as a management tool are cited in subsequent sections for each of the three types of research partners Sida supports:

- At the global level, an organization funded largely by Sida created a plan to increase social science research on climate change that gave it a new direction.
- On the regional research network level, one partner noted the RBM training “not only helped us deliver on its current projects but also to raise our profile and strengthen ability to remain a center for excellent in support of research and capacity building in [specific development sector].”
- At the university level, a university developed an umbrella logical framework and used it to develop fundable multi-disciplinary projects involving main academic departments.
Section II: Programme Planning

Key RBM Concepts

&

How to use RBM for Programme Planning

The Results-Based Management (RBM) Logical Framework or logframe is the backbone of the RBM logical model. It consists of eight elements, starting first with a summary statement of the problem to be solved. In addition to the description here, a set of Critical Questions to Ask in Developing a RBM Logical Framework is provided in Annex B.

A. What’s the Problem?

Correctly identifying the problem or challenge is essential to a results-based approach. It is the springboard for correctly establishing the results to be attained by the programme’s work.

The Problem is Key. The problems to be solved have to be focused and manageable. Sida-funded research cannot completely solve a problem that inhibits “development” but they can make a contribution toward the larger goal, for example, of “poverty reduction”. Clearly, other research funders may also be contributing to solving the problem. Research partners have to focus on problems that are narrow enough that they - within their resources - can realistically expect to (help) solve. Key is breaking down and narrowing the problem to what you can deal with in applying research to specific developmental challenges.

Dimensions of a Problem

Problems are typically multi-dimensional and you as a planner will first need to sketch out the most relevant dimensions that you can address.

Start with Problem Definition

Since this is the pivotal point in RBM process, a problem assessment or needs analysis often precedes and serves as the basis for the follow steps comprising the problem definition.

- Name the problem

A first step is to give the problem a name. This is harder than it would seem. If names are correct and to the point, they can both inspire and guide. For example, while the mission of the World Food Programme is “to eradicate hunger in the world”, the name for one problem it addresses is “emergency needs for food” in the context of natural disasters like the tsunami. A problem identified by one university partner was “low adaptive capacity to the effects of climate change.”

- List the causes

The next, and perhaps most difficult step, is to identify the causes of the problem. Very few problems, if any, have a single cause. Most are the result of a variety of factors. Since attempts to solve problems inevitably must be addressed to their causes, determining the cause is critical. We will look at how to do this in a minute.

- Outline the context and linkages
Problems also take place in a context. Context means that there is an environment of other problems which, while not being causal factors, condition what solutions are feasible. For example, a classic public policy context is the amount of resources available to public actors, or the time available to act because of the political system. In the university case, the low adaptive capacity was due to rural communities’ heavy dependency on climate for their income and also a lack of information on their vulnerabilities and possible adaptation measures.

➢ Determine stakeholders and actors
In the solution to any problem (and to an extent in its causes) there will be different stakeholders or actors, often in policy realm, private sector, and delivery. A stakeholder is someone (or some institution) that either is affected by a problem, would benefit from its solution, or is essential to solving the problem. Knowing who these are helps make planning precise, since stakeholders usually must be involved. In the university example, the main stakeholders were the affected rural communities and the government officials whose job was to work with them.

➢ Identify alternative solutions
Finally, there are alternative solutions for any problems. Not all of them are really workable, but if they are identified, they can help make the nature of the problem clear and can help establish criteria for selecting a solution that will work.

As it is one of the most critical parts of the RBM planning process, let’s review:

Problem – Summary basic steps
1. Narrow problem to partner’s purpose and break it down to the factors you can influence.
2. Define the dimensions of the problem & role of organization
3. Problem analysis through stakeholder participation
4. Translate problem into a form that shows how elements are connected (sometimes called a “theory of change”)
5. Narrow problem definition to shorter-time frames
6. Agree on target population and coordinated roles in addressing problem
7. Summarize essence of problem in a Summary Problem Statement

The essence of these steps is summarized in a one sentence Summary Problem Statement agreed upon by key stakeholders and placed at the top of the RBM Logical Framework template.

It is critical that you break the problem down to the level you can reasonably expect to help solve within the limited time frame of the programme or projects and that you ensure all principle stakeholders agree on the Summary Problem Statement.

For example:
• “Social science not contributing sufficiently to solving global problems of climate change.” (global level)
• “Graduates from agricultural educational programmes in sub-Saharan Africa are not well prepared or qualified for working in the agricultural sector. (regional research network)
“In the context of the burden of disease in Southern Africa, disability is historically a neglected area …, health services are not always accessible to people who experience barriers (the disabled) and implementation (feasibility, affordability, practicality) is going to become the new challenge in resource poor settings … particularly as people who experience disabilities are disproportionately affected by poverty and lack livelihood resources (that) could enable them to access services.” (university-based institution)

**Exercise**

In your workbook based on Annex D, define the problem that your programme or organization is trying to solve. Proceed to fill out the table (The table will include the bullets of problem as illustrated above and conclude with the Summary Problem Statement)

When the intervention is shared (using participatory analysis) you start to solve the problem together. It’s the start of coming up with a collective solution and a better integrated approach that compels action.

**B. What are Results?**

We will be going in to greater detail of Results in the Monitoring and Reporting and Evaluation sections (III and IV), but as you plan your programme, you need to be aware of the intended results, as well as the assumptions based on a risk analysis. Here is a brief introduction.

What is a result? According to the OECD/DAC Glossary of Evaluation terms, a result is

“The output, outcome or impact (intended or unintended, positive &/or negative) of a development intervention.”

Interestingly, the term ‘result’ is not formally defined, but in practice involves a hierarchy.

Hierarchy of results: don’t confuse them as each is different.

- At the highest level, a result is the achievement of the objectives that the Programme has set for itself to help address the problem when the objective is attained. This is what is often called impact.  

- To achieve that objective, certain outcomes have to be obtained as a consequence of the Programmes work.

- The tangible direct results of that work are the outputs that are produced.

In the past, the focus was on the activities and the outputs they produced, since they were the easiest to measure. **Today, the focus is on the outcomes that together lead to the achievement of objectives.**

**Verifying Results**

---

6 Impact is also defined as long-term changes in the beneficiary population, and this often takes place after the programme’s time horizon. For that reason, the narrower definition of achievement of objectives is used.
Results have to be verified. There are two key concepts that you need to keep in mind:

- **Validity** – are you measuring what you think you are?
- **Reliability** – if another researcher used your data collection method, would he or she acquire the same data?

**Results Model (or Chain)**

Perhaps the hierarchical aspect of *Results* could be better explained as a *Results Chain*.

The results chain is a conceptual tool used by all practitioners of RBM. This is a depiction of the causal or logical relationships between inputs, activities, outputs, the outcomes and the objective of a given policy, programme, or initiative. Allowing you to break change down into a series of steps related by cause and effect, it is the ‘theory of change’ used by an organization.

Think about the result you want to achieve and then *plan backwards*.

As your basic sequence in RBM planning, start with:

- the objective that should be met
- the outcomes that will need to be achieved to reach the objective
- the outputs that will (help) induce the outcomes (changes),
- the activities you will have to perform to provide the outputs (product or services) and finally
- the inputs you will need to run the activities.

During the implementation phase, the basic sequence is reversed. Funds are received, activities run, outputs produced, outcome obtained and objectives achieved. During the evaluation phase of the RBM process, the sequence reverts back to the same order as in planning.
The RBM Logical Framework

As part of the exercises related to material in this handbook, you will be working on developing your own Logical Framework or logframe.\textsuperscript{7} The logframe, the common point of focus, is a tool for managing the partnership, negotiating and communicating. Different organizations use different templates for logframes and SIDA has no formal template. However, over the course of six years, a model has been found by research support partners to be highly useful.

You will be using this model of the RBM logical framework during the programme planning phase because it is simple and more straightforward. It includes performance indicators at only one level for outcomes, rather than at all levels and becoming excessively complex:

\textsuperscript{7} It is important to note that the overall logframe of a programme or an institution is sometimes derived from more detailed logframes developed by e.g., faculties, departments, research groups, students (working for a bigger objective). Other times such logframes are derived from one programme with a defined and narrow objective.
Results-Based Management Logical Framework

A copy of this logframe is in Annex B. As you go through each section of this handbook, a series of exercises on programme planning found in Annex D will ask you to fill out the logframe for your own programme or project.

Sida, like many other funders of research, insists on the logical framework as a way for demonstrating that the partner organization or network knows what it is doing and that there’s a clear line of reasoning (logic) they can subscribe to. The logframe is a management tool for planning, monitoring and evaluating. As such, it is the common reference point for each of the three phases of the RBM Process.

What Makes a Good Logframe?

- A sound problem summary statement key stakeholder agree upon (already covered)
- Objectives focus on the problem to be addressed
- Outcomes show short-term and intermediate changes needed to achieve the objective
- Outputs lead to the outcomes
- Performance indicators verify the change has happened

C. Objectives

Once you have defined the problem, you will be able to determine what your programme can reasonably change to solve the problem. These are the objectives.

The highest-level concept in RBM as practiced is the objective. All work is focused toward achieving an objective. It involves deciding where you want to go in the period of time covered by the programme and describing that as an end-state.

Objective, according to OECD/DAC Glossary of Evaluation Terms is:

- “An overall desired achievement involving a process of change aimed at meeting certain needs of identified beneficiaries within a given period of time.” or
The situation you will observe at the end of a specific period.

Here are some research cooperation examples of Overall (overarching) Objectives:

- “Increase in the use of social science knowledge in policies and programmes at all levels to contribute to solving priority global problems like climate change,” (at global level)
- “Agricultural educational programmes in sub-Saharan Africa are in agreement with African priorities within a framework that will produce an adequate number of quality graduates working in the agricultural sector.” (a regional research network)
- “To significantly influence global, regional and national policy and programmes on HIV/AIDS.” (a university-based partner)

There can be more than one objective for a programme, but usually they are what are called Specific Objectives focused on a thematic area or a specific target group.

**Objectives - basic steps**

How will you articulate your programme’s objectives? As the objective is the overall desired state or change in the problem, it must:

1. Specify an observable end-state i.e. They must identify a specific change in the problem or situation
2. Be in measurable terms
3. Identify a target group or population
4. Establish a time frame

Examples of Specific Objectives:

- “Increase the amount of interdisciplinary, comparative social science knowledge produced in all regions and internationally addressing priority problems,” (at the global level).
- “To improve context relevance through contextualized educational materials development and enhanced delivery for graduates to perform effectively in the agricultural sector, by 2014.” (at the regional research network level):
- “To increase the adoption of resilient eco-practices by the communities to 50% by 2020” (a University-based partner).

**Exercise:**

In annex D there is an outline of a logframe. Fill out your Objective/s in the space provided for **Specific Objectives**. Remember to follow the basic steps above while drafting your objective/s.

**D. Outcomes**

The second highest-level concept in results-based management is the desired outcomes.

Outcomes are the changes that must happen during the plan period to achieve the objective. Usually, multiple outcomes are needed to attain a single objective and they

---

8 See Annex B for more RBM logframe examples.
may have to happen in sequence, with immediate outcomes required for intermediate outcomes.

There are two broad types of outcomes in research cooperation: *internal* results within academic or research community (whether universities or networks) and *external results* involving the use of research outside the research community. The external results are what is meant by the phrase “research as a tool for development.” There is a need to focus on both, to present a convincing case.

Outcomes are:

- "The likely or achieved short- and medium-term effects of an intervention’s outputs” (*OECD/DAC Glossary of Evaluation Terms*)
- Situations that will be observed when outputs make changes happen

E.g., “Increased use of research projects by government agencies”

Articulating your outcomes involves deciding how you want to achieve the objective by making intermediate changes and expressing them in end-state terms. Like an objective, an outcome is an end-state, a change that happens (in part) due to the outputs of the programme and that can be seen at a particular point in time.

The presumption is that if your programme is well-formulated, with realistic expected outcomes, you will be able to make those results happen.

**Characteristics of Outcomes**

Well-defined outcomes have five characteristics:

- A change that leads to fulfillment of an objective
  - They are changes that *have to happen* if an objective is to be achieved.
  - An intermediate change or consequence of a Programme’s output in the programme’s target population
  - They happen after the outputs are produced but before the Objective is achieved.
  - Usually a result of several outputs although a single output can have several outcomes
  - They are something that can be shown to have happened as a consequence of producing an output or several outputs.
  - Is observable and can be described
  - They are a change that can be observed to have taken place and is describable
  - Is not under direct control of programme/project

An Outcome is not something that is under the direct control of a programme. A programme’s outputs can -- and should -- influence an outcome, but *cannot guarantee* that the outcome will occur.

Well-formulated outcomes describe to stakeholders *what the programme will do to achieve agreed objectives*. They are about what programme managers will be held accountable. For that reason:

- They have to be expressed in observable, therefore measurable, terms. If they cannot be observed, it will not be possible to determine whether or not they have been accomplished.
They should be non-trivial, i.e., they should clearly be a significant factor in whether the objective will be achieved or not.

They must be realistic. An organization should not promise more than it plausibly can deliver. But the tendency to be over-cautious in defining what is expected should also be avoided, so be realistic and ambitious.

A word about the time frame. Outcomes are immediate and intermediate because they happen in sequence. There is often a ripple effect: E.g.

1. An individual receives a Ph.D. Degree
2. He gets a job because of his degree
3. He uses the skills learned during the PhD training on the job to generate research
4. Applied research findings influences the world

**Drafting your Outcomes**

The criterion for drafting outcomes is similar to drafting objectives. Outcomes, however, need to meet two other criteria, they must also be:

1. “SMART” and
2. Achievable, since the focus since the focus of RBM is on intermediate changes.

SMART is an acronym for Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Timely. This applies only to Outcomes.

**The SMART Criteria for drafting your outcomes:**

Outcomes should be 'SMART'

1. Are they Specific?
2. Can progress be Measured (verified) for each of them?
3. Are they Achievable?
4. Are expected accomplishments Relevant to problem?
5. Can they be done in a Timely manner?

Examples of outcomes drawn from the model logframes in Annex:

• “Increased number of researchers linked to the organisation receive funding for new international interdisciplinary and comparative research by (time target)” (global level)
• “At least 50% of the trained experts use skills learnt to produce learning resources by June 2014” (regional research network)
• “Demonstration and extension service centres established at district level by (time target)” (University-located partner)

Exercise
Go back to the logframe you are creating. Fill out your Outcomes in the space provided for them. Remember to follow the SMART and other criteria above while drafting them and then, see if they pass the three-point test:

Three tests for an outcome:
   (1) Does it lead to the objective?
   (2) Is it measurable (verifiable)?
   (3) Does it have a plausible causal connection to the output (explained below), at least as a contributing factor?

Obtaining your outcomes leads to achieving your objectives.

E. Outputs
This is the third level concept of results in results-based management and is the one most relied on in conventional log-frame matrices.

There are two types of outputs: products and services.

☐ “The products, capital goods and services which result from a development intervention” (OECD/DAC Glossary of Evaluation Terms)

☐ What is produced or provided by your programme or project and are under your organization’s control

Outputs are the immediate product or service that is produced by your programme activities. They denote the volume of work accomplished by a programme and are usually expressed in a quantity, e.g. the number of workshop participants trained, symposiums sponsored or meetings coordinated, customers provided with services, or case studies prepared.

E.g. “Five-day training workshops coordinated annually by the partner entity for technicians in each region”

Characteristics of Outputs
☐ They are the immediate result of activities
☐ Help induce the intended outcomes
☐ May require a series of outputs to achieve an outcome
☐ Should be expressed in tangible and measurable terms

Examples of Outputs
Here are some generic examples of both the product and service types of outputs.

Product:
☐ A report or study
☐ A new technique developed in a laboratory
☐ Analysis

Service:
Organize a donors meeting (the outcome would be the donors donate)
Provide advice or make a recommendation

It is often difficult to understand the distinction between outputs and outcomes. Here are some examples side by side:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Product or service provided by project</td>
<td>• What happens after you provide the product or service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• You can produce or provide them</td>
<td>• You can influence their use in others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• They are within the control of the project</td>
<td>• They are not within control of project: dependent on others outside the project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples:
• Research Unit offers advice to policymaker
• Indexing facility is created and undertakes indexing of publications

Examples:
• Policymaker uses advice, reflecting it in formulation of new policy
• The index is used to obtain and cite research results

Examples of specific outcomes from the model RBM logframe follow:
• “Social science research generated by researchers from the Global South linked to the partner’s activities is disseminated/referenced/used by other researchers” (global level).
• “50% of the trained experts use skill learned to produce learning resources by June 2014” (regional research network).
• “Increased use of research published on the website by key stakeholders” (university level).

Exercise:
Go back to your workbook and the logframe you are creating. Fill out your Outputs that you expect to have, in the space provided for them. Remember that they are the immediate result of activities and help induce the intended outcome (changes).

F. Performance Indicators
Performance Indicators help an organization define and measure progress toward its organizational goals expressed as outcomes. Once your organization has analyzed its mission, identified all its stakeholders, and defined its outcomes (and outputs) for the period in question, you need a way to measure whether the outcomes have happened. Performance Indicators are these measurements.
Performance Indicators are quantifiable measurements, agreed to beforehand, that reflect the critical success of a programme. They will differ depending on the organization’s expected outcomes. For example:

- If the intended outcome is an increase in return customers, a business may have as one of its Performance Indicators the percentage of its income that comes from return customers,
- A school that wants an improvement in graduation rates may focus its Performance Indicators on graduation rates of its students.

Performance Indicators are used exclusively for Outcomes. A best practice is to identify one Performance Indicator as a measure for each outcome (one-for-one), not multiple indicators. Why? Because usually two or more indicators are pointing to separate outcomes and for every PI there is a data collection requirement. A host of measures create a burden on data collectors and in reporting.

Performance Indicators are the evidence that the outcome (change) has happened or has begun to happen. Remember that they relate only to Outcomes – preferably one per outcome. Look at each outcome and ask, “if this is progressing, what would I see?”

Performance Indicators:

- Are what will be seen if the outcome/change happens
- Verify whether progress is being made (or not) in achieving the outcomes
- Can be early warning system for identifying problems

A Performance Indicator needs to meet two tests:

1. Does it reflect that the outcome is connected to an output?
2. Is it measurable, can you collect data on it?

If the data for the Performance Indicator are not accessible or obtainable, it’s not a good Performance Indicator!

**Criteria for good Indicator**

1. Should relate to a specific outcome.
2. It should be able to measure whether the specific outcome has been achieved.
3. It should be measurable (you can collect data on it)
4. It should be expressed in only a few words - clearly stated
5. Collection of data should be cost-effective. It is not time or resource consuming
6. It should be determined by key partners → increased sense of ownership

Agreement by the key stakeholders also ensures that it has credibility

Examples of Performance Indicators from the model RBM logframes in Annex B:

- “Change in the number and distribution of researchers linked to ISSC who receive funding for new international interdisciplinary and comparative research.” (at the global level)
- “Percentage of trained experts producing contextualized learning resources. “(at the regional network level)
- “Change in the number of demonstration and extension service centres established at district level.” (at the University level)

**Exercise**

Insert the performance indicators that will show that your outcomes are being achieved in the space provided for them. Remember it is preferable to have 1 performance indicator per outcome. Look at each outcome and ask:

- Does the indicator answer the question: “did the change happen?”
- Does it relate to the outcome?
- Can data be found that will measure it?
- Can data be found at a reasonable cost?

**A. Baseline Data**

Baseline data is collected at one point in time and is used as a point of reference against which results will be measured or assessed in the future. Many Performance Indicators are based on measuring change and the best way to measure change is to compare the future to the initial situation (the baseline). If it is a new programme, it’s possible a baseline does not exist yet, so the baseline would be zero.

Having or establishing baseline data makes targeting the Outcomes with a specific number realistic and meaningful, rather than making them hallow promises.

There are two options:

- Use established baselines, which may be from other data sources. In some cases, previous evaluations will provide a base-line
- If baseline data does not exist, the data you collect in the first period becomes your baseline for the next period.

Remember that:

- The data can be quantitative and/or qualitative data. A baseline is needed for each performance indicator that will be used to measure results during the programme.

Based on an established baseline, a realistic target can be established. For example, if an outcome was “to increase the households in region with access to and use of safe
drinking water”, and the baseline was 5% at the moment, a 1st year target for the outcome is 25% of households with access and use might be reasonable and at the end of the initiative target is to 65% of the households. The target is realistic because it takes into account the low percentage established during the baseline study and the fact that some communities in the region are very remote and potentially difficult to work in.

Examples of Baseline Data

- In 2013 the number of invitations to international meetings, were five. So baseline is five (at the global level).
- The baseline is zero since there were no trainees trained in the pedagogy of developing and producing contextualized learning materials for Tertiary Agricultural Education (TAE) and training programmes (at the regional network level).
- For the indicator “Percentage of the population accessing emergency scenarios publications”, where the target is 70%, the baseline in 2013 was 20%. (partner located at a university).

Exercise

Insert the baseline data for each indicator in your logframe.

G. Data Collection Strategy

The first step in determining how to collect data on Performance Indicators is to identify a data source that specifies where the relevant information can be found. In turn, the data sources have to be accessible and practical.

The source has to be accessible in the sense that a manager can get information from it. For example, there may be very good data in a confidential national database, but if the organization doing the evaluation does not have access to it, it is not very useful. Similarly, there might be very good information in a commercial database like Lexus/Nexus, but if it costs money and the organization doesn’t have a subscription, it isn’t realistic to use it as the source for obtaining data.

Data collection can be a participatory process implemented with stakeholders gathering data.

The strategy should be built in from the start. During the planning phase, the preliminary data collection strategy built into the last several elements of the RBM Logframe has a twofold focus: how the data will be collected and when. Subsequently, a more robust is formulated during the early stage of the Programme Implementation Phase of the RBM process in the form of the Data Collection Strategy (DCS). It indicates what data will be collected, where (source), how (methods), by whom, and when. This will be described in greater detail in Section III, Monitoring and Reporting.

H. Assumptions and Risk Analysis

As you plan your programme, you will have to assume certain facts that are the basis of risk analysis. Assumptions are external factors, outside the control of the programme that must be considered when planning the intervention. They form a part of risk analysis.

Once you decide to go with an intervention, the risk you take is that the assumptions won’t hold, because you don’t control them.
For example:
- the global economic situation may change and reduce donor’s ability to fund global research (global level)
- Sufficient rain falls to ensure farmers can implement a technique (regional research network);
- the university administration may change and reduce an emphasis on research (at the university level)

Assumptions to be considered are the most critical ones that will affect, or risk, the success of the intervention; and can also explain a possible eventual lack of achievement. Thus they can be used to analyze risk.

Risk analysis
The first thing to do is to question whether your assumptions will hold. For that you must:
- Make sure your assumptions are clear
- Assess the assumption as High, Medium, Low risk
  - Ask what the probability is that the assumption will not hold
  - If they are not likely to hold, it’s a risk
- Formulate a risk statement
- Develop a strategy to minimize the risk

Here is an example:
A regional research network had as an assumption that “National political situations will not affect the operation the program negatively” and assessed the risk as moderate. If the assumption did not hold, the programme would be adjusted accordingly.

Using RBM as a Planning tool
RBM can be used as a planning tool by serving as a basis for:
- Initial Proposal for Sida (or other funding agencies) support
- Strategic Planning
- Annual Operation Workplan
- Monitoring and Evaluation (and Learning) Plan

For example, participants from Sida-funded organizations taking part in an RBM workshop noted the following good practices:
- At the global level, one institution used the RBM workshop as an opportunity “to refine our long term strategic framework and compile it in a relatively short period of time.”
- A regional network noted that “the emphasis on result-based planning and reporting was also instrumental for the programme and its supported projects in the planning and implementation of our subsequent activities”
- One University used the RBM workshop in particular with regards to developing proposals that would be accepted for funding.
With the RBM Logical Framework completed, the transition to results-focused management is already underway, no longer leading the programme toward hazy horizons. Managing for Results is now a distinctly charted course that can be navigated.

*Exercise:*

Take a look at the logframe you have created in your workbook. Does it meet the requirements for a good logframe? Does it satisfy the key uses of the logframe in your programme planning stage?
## Basic Definitions of Key Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Logic model</strong></td>
<td>How we affect change. The logic model for inducing the ultimate beneficiaries, what should be the end state and how</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problem</strong></td>
<td>The problem to be solved together. The situation or conditions to be addressed for a specific target group and changed (resolved or ameliorated) together by the programme intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives</strong></td>
<td>The “to what end?” The end-state change to be attained in a fixed time period. What the intervention aims to change over the longer run. Achieving the objective constitutes impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes</strong></td>
<td>What is expected to happen when you produce outputs. The intended immediate and intermediate effects of a programme or project outputs that are outside the control of the intervention, but within its influence, (e.g., changes in policies or and practices, articles published in international peer-reviewed professional journals). They lead to the achievement of the objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators</strong></td>
<td>Points to the observation or evidence to make a convincing case. What is measured or observed to verify the outcome (change) has happened and to gauge progress. The basis to collect data by which we demonstrated whether a desired outcome (change) has or is happening in progressing toward the intended outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outputs</strong></td>
<td>What is produced as an immediate product or service provided. It is produced by an intervention and is in the control of the entity (e.g., seminars, publications).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities</strong></td>
<td>What is done to produce the outputs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inputs</strong></td>
<td>Resources provided to the intervention.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section III: Programme Implementation: Monitoring and Reporting

Results-based Management is not just preparing a Logframe in measurable terms: the real test in an RBM approach is whether the programme is measuring up to its promises and helping make them happen. A way of looking at the RBM process is to see it as a sequence. You have just completed the first part of the sequence: programme planning, where you set out a vision for the programme in response to a problem, defined objectives and outcomes as intended results, set priorities, analyzed risk and determined resource needs.

Now let’s move to the next part of the RBM process: programme implementation, which involves monitoring performance results and reporting progress.

Rational for Monitoring Results

Monitoring consists of collecting data as an ongoing process in order to assess progress towards obtaining outcomes and achieving objectives. Data collection is key. Data is collected by and shared within and between the implementing partners as key stakeholders and monitored to track progress of results and resources consumed, and ultimately establish the basis for preparing an annual progress report. As a participatory process that involves partnering key stakeholders, RBM is a management tool used for learning, adjusting and decision-making.

- Monitoring is a means of assessing whether promises are being kept.
  - There is a need to monitor whether the intended results, as established in the planning phase, are on track to being achieved. Monitoring establishes a track record that outcomes are happening.
- Reassures funding sources
  - Sida mandates monitoring and reporting progress toward RBM results
- You can fix what is not working, and learn from what is working

RBM is all about results – whether or not promises made are kept. Now that most Sida research partners have established RBM Logical Frameworks with “measurable” results, both partners as well as Sida need to know how they are doing and what outcome results they are achieving during the programme implementation phase.

Point of Focus: Outcome Data

We have learned in the planning section that outcomes are the changes that must happen to achieve the objective. Obtaining outcome data is the primary focus during the monitoring process together with output data, which must have a clear and plausible link to those outcomes. Remember that monitoring should be a participatory process and include an agreed upon data collection strategy.

Prerequisites for outcome data collection

- It should be a participatory open process involving implementing partners, key stakeholders
Logical frameworks designed so that outcomes can be measured

You have already established what results including outcomes you are aiming for in measurable terms.

A data collection strategy that is being implemented with collaborative partners gathering data in an on-going manner.

Agreement on a data collection plan is important. Involve your collaborative partners in a participative process that designates the source of the data and the strategy for collecting and analyzing that data.

Adjustments to the Data Collection Strategy and procedures as programme implementation proceeds to close gaps in systematic collection of outcome data should be built in.

From an RBM process perspective, the first three prerequisites are part of the RBM Logical Framework developed during the first phase of programme planning. Specifying and adjusting the data collection strategy is part of the second phase of the RBM cycle: programme implementation.

Monitoring performance and reporting results involve three basic types of activities: data collecting results (especially outcome) data, assessing progress, and reporting results.

A. Collecting Data

Since RBM is an evidence-based process, data are essential in Results-Based Management. Sida-supported research entities along with their implementing partners need to systematically record their observations of the outcome results that are taking place due to their outputs.

3 stages of data collection:

Planning for data collection:

This is your first step and is done in the RBM Planning Phase. Involving co-partners in the identifying the outcome results data needed and then in the collection process is a natural outgrowth of reaching out to them as strategic partners early in the process and making them a part of the stakeholders involved in formulating the logframe.

In this stage, key stakeholders agree on:

- Using a common RBM Logical Framework matrix
- The overall data collection process established in the two right hand columns of the RBM logframe template (see Annex B).

Implementing data collection activities:

In this stage, key stakeholders agree on and proceed to implement:

- The Data Collection Strategy, including the respective roles for the Sida-supported entity and its implementing partners is further defined specified as shown below.
- A common reporting format (more on that later).
The Data Collection Strategy (DCS) is specified by answering the following questions: *What* data are to be collected for each Performance Indicator? *What* is your data source? *How* are they going to be collected (the data collection methods)? *Who* is going to collect the information? and, *When*? In doing this, you will be building an on-going data collection effort into the RBM progress.

Try to establish the complete strategy early in the implementation phase, keep the process simple so co-partners are willing to be a part of it, and build it in so it is routine, cost-effective and not a major burden at some later point in time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicators in the RBM Logframe</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Data Collection Method</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Data Collection Strategy is then implemented so data is collected systematically and consistently is as follows. This involves the need to:

- Build data collection into routine administrative processes. This reduces cost
- Systematically record performance data
- Build observations into field visit reports
- Keep a file of newspaper clippings, vignettes, and illustrative examples of what is happening as a result of the programme.

The process brings out the answer to the larger question, “What do we have to know?” A technique for this is to *express each indicator in the form of a question or questions.*

For example:

- At the global level, if the Performance Indicator is “Change in the use of research by other researchers.” it is really the question “How many citations were there compared to the baseline?”
- If the Performance Indicator for a regional network is: “% increase in regional collaboration” convert it into question: “To what extent has there been increase in regional collaboration?”
- If the Performance Indicator for a regional network is “% increase in use of research results by intended audiences: the question would be “Has there been an increased use of research results by these audiences?”
At the university level if the Performance Indicator for the outcome “Increased use of research published on the website by key stakeholders” is “Change in accesses to research on the website and/or social media (number of downloads of research outputs)” the question would be “Compared to the baseline usage, how many accesses to the website have there been?”

**Reporting and using data collected: How is it going to be used and reported?**

Measure, assess and report progress towards results achieved and make adjustments when and where required during the life of the intervention.

**Different Types of Outcome Data**

To make judgments about performance, we need to monitor implementation progress not only in terms of outputs and expenditures but also outcome results attained. As noted in Section II, there are two categories of results for which it is important to establish a record:

- **internal results** are uses made within the academic setting (e.g. universities) or research institute, such as advanced degrees received, obtaining a job because of the degree, or getting a research paper published in a peer reviewed journal; and

- **external results** are used outside the research community (whether university or networks) by target audiences or users for application or use, such as use of research degree on the job in private sector, or applied research influences policies created for a specific sector.

Most research cooperation programmes plan to have both types of results, but in the past external results have not been collected as systematically as internal. Data on both types of outcomes should be collected.

Use of results narratives help to enrich the picture of what the program has achieved with anecdotes, vignettes, case studies, testimonials as a complement to the quantitative data provides further evidence of the change and demonstrates how the change has affected people or conditions.

Regardless of type of data, there is a need to indicate plausible causality between the outputs and the outcomes:

- An observed difference has a causal connection with the programme’s output
- Relationship has to have occurred during the programme’s time horizon
- More than one thing could have caused change
- Would it have happened anyway?

**Data Sources**

Data sources are the resources where you can get information about your outcome data.

Here are some sources you can use:
Reports, internal and external that are generated by the programme
Policy statements related to the programme
Regular statistical series, including baseline data
Administrative documents of the programme
People who can be interviewed through surveys or focus groups
Observation on-site during missions

**Possible Data Collection Methods**

The tools of data collection are now fairly standard. You have to select the tool or tools that can extract the right information, at a reasonable cost and on time. Your data collection strategy could well involve both primary and secondary sources of data.

These include, but are not limited to:

- Content analysis
- Use of existing statistical series
- Focus groups/interviews
- Surveys
- Field visits
- Case studies
- Journals
- Anecdotes and vignettes

In choosing collection methods, there is a distinction between intrusive and non-intrusive data collection methods.

*Intrusive methods* mean that someone besides the partners will be used to provide or obtain information - by being interviewed, participating in focus groups or filling out questionnaires. This is more costly because of the time involved.

*Non-intrusive methods* use data that can be collected and analyzed exclusively by the partners. Some data can be collected without intrusion by using existing data sources found in documents.

Comparing the two methods, non-intrusive information is clearly less costly, since it doesn’t involve others, but is often insufficient to respond to the questions in the performance indicators.
Why bother collecting data?

It is important to collect data as it gives credibility to your progress. It

Establishes a basis for making adjustments going forward

Provides good opportunity to communicate with partners

Required for reporting

Makes reports more credible

Exercise:

Using the Data Collection Strategy, determine for each performance indicator:

1. Data to be collect
2. Source(s) of data
3. Method of collection
4. Who should collect the data
5. When to collect data

B. Assessing Progress

If you have clearly identified your intended outcomes in measurable terms and have been collecting information\(^9\) in an ongoing basis, assessing progress is simply an exercise in comparing actual results observed, using your data as evidence, to the intended results established in the RBM Logical Framework developed during the programme planning phase. This allows the concept of outcomes and outputs to be consistently applied though the full RBM cycle, including monitoring and reporting.

If implementing partners are involved, keep the approach participative\(^{10}\). Assessing progress provides the occasion for implementing partners to review together what results, individually and collectively, have actually been attained. Having the benefit of the individual and collective data and insights from the respective partners provides a stronger basis to draw conclusions about the true picture and to determine what adjustments need to be made for further progress. Judgments based on data are key. The crux of the process is to:

✓ Assess progress based on measurable results data linked to intended outcomes

✓ Determine what has been achieved towards intended (planned) outcome based on your collective outcome data at hand and

\(^9\) If you want what happened in results terms to be scientifically valid and reliable (see Section IV), you need to record it as accurately and consistently as possible before you start making any comparisons to the planned (intended) results. Observations come first, then interpretation.

\(^{10}\) It is important to remember that the overall logframe of a programme or an institution is sometimes derived from more detailed logframes developed by e.g., faculties, departments, research groups, students (working for a bigger objective). Other times such logframes are derived from one programme with a defined and a narrow objective.
Discuss any variance between the two, and
Agree on what further adjustments need to be made.

Now you are ready to prepare your annual progress report, because the internal joint review helps the team agree on the status of the programme, what has been achieved, and what adjustments, if any, are needed. Partners will see how data already collected can be used for reporting purposes and also see firsthand the power that comes from managing to their outcome results

C. Reporting Results

Reporting on outcome results is not an end in itself, but is an important part of effective management and accountability. The basis is the established logical framework and this consequently serves a dual purpose, that of programme planning tool and, in slightly modified form, that of programme reporting tool for accountability to donor organizations.

Reporting is an integral part of an organization’s ongoing operations and helps in decision-making and organizational learning. Reporting your results is also a requirement for Sida and many other funding agencies. To say donors and the international community are asking to see results is to say they will welcome outcome results with supporting evidence.

The process should be done with implementing partners. Results reporting should help promote a “continuous improvement” feedback loop for the next planning cycle, while also providing the basis for sharing narrative results. Progress reporting can actually be quite simple and straightforward.

Report to whom?

Who you report to is determined by the programme’s funding and governance, but can include:

1. Internal Stakeholders
2. National Counterparts, especially governments who are not yet convinced about the value of funding research from their own resources
3. Funders
   - to inform the funding agency
   - to provide a basis for decisions around future funding

Keep in mind

... those who report on results can be defended
... those who don’t are vulnerable

Basic Reporting: focusing on results

Reporting your results helps keep you focused on your progress towards achieving intended outcomes

- Progress is backed up by data
- Examples and other anecdotal data are also important: they’re good for conveying impact/perceptions of impact at individual level
Use of a results narrative helps to enrich the picture of what the programme has achieved with anecdotes, vignettes, case studies, testimonials. As a complement to the quantitative data, this provides further evidence of the change and demonstrates how the change has affected people or conditions.

- Implementing & using results data
  - Need simple procedure to collect and record information
  - Use field visits to gather evidence and observe progress
  - Need to include data in an annual report to funders and stakeholders

Data can be hard and soft: actual results, numerical as well as anecdotal, are often best recalled when expressed in human terms and personal situations

**Using the Logframe for RBM Reporting**

The purpose of the annual report is to provide a basis for discussion with funders, stakeholders and internally.

As “results” are the common point of focus for reporting, the RBM Logical Framework is the point of reference for reporting. You can report in terms of what you have “promised” in the logframe during the planning phase by showing what progress you have achieved against the same benchmarks by indicating how you are progressing during implementation in terms actual results of those same intended results stated as outputs and outcomes.

Reporting to Sida can use the approach suggested here based on a slightly modified logframe matrix that makes progress reporting in the Annual Report relatively simple and straightforward. Remember that the RBM logical framework example template which was developed during the programme planning phase looks as follows:
Results-Based Management Logical Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Outputs</th>
<th>Outcomes (including targets)</th>
<th>Performance Indicator of Outcome</th>
<th>Baseline (if established)</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Data Collection Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specific Objective 1:

1.1

1.2

1.3

Assumptions

Applying this RBM framework for reporting purposes\textsuperscript{11} permits showing the actual results attained during the performance year, as seen below where expected outputs and outcomes are taken from the RBM logframe:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of problem statement (1 sentence max.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Objective:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of outputs expected</th>
<th>Outcomes expected (including targets)</th>
<th>Performance indicator of outcomes</th>
<th>Outcome results observed in year</th>
<th>Outputs produced in year to obtain outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specific Objective 1:

1.1

1.2

Assumptions

A partial sample of such a RBM Logframe report on the following page provides an example of what a reporting structure would look like.

This approach has several merits. It:

- involves a minimal amount of time and effort, as it is similar to the planning logframe.
- maintains the distinction between outcomes and outputs

\textsuperscript{11} See Annex C for the full outline of Suggested Annual Reporting Structure.
continues the focus on results i.e., whether intended outcomes in fact became actual outcomes.
helps establish a plausible link between the outputs and outcomes showing how the outputs helped achieve outcomes, and
shows a clear picture of what actually happened because of the programme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outputs (including targets)</th>
<th>Performance Indicator of Outcome</th>
<th>Outcome Results Observed in year</th>
<th>[Key] Outputs produced in year to obtain outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vision for agricultural education and training Report of status, trends and needs for graduate employment. Updated methodology. Trained curriculum reviewers. Reports on curricula reviews and quality analysis of institutions. Proposed curricula frameworks</td>
<td>1.1. Buy-in by institutional leaders in the organization’s member institutions on the need, process and application of curricula reviews by end of year.</td>
<td>At least 25 % of Pilot Institutions reviewing their curricula this year and next.</td>
<td>Six pilot institutions (representing 37.5%) have gone through curriculum review and these are…</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specific Objective 1: To propose curricula frameworks that enable agricultural graduates to meet the recommended technical and behavioral outcomes expected in working in the agricultural sector, by year xx

The organization’s secretariat has organized three regional workshops on Reforming curricula in 2013. These are the following:
1.1.1a. Discussion on curriculum reforms organized at the science week.
1.1.1b. The policy dialogue on curriculum reforms held and brought together xx participants…
1.1.1c. Education fair held…

What makes a good Annual Report or a Final Report?

- A summary statement of progress made during the reporting period
- Progress is noted in results terms for both outcomes and outputs results established in the logframe
- Progress toward the intended outcomes is gauged by data for the performance indicator(s) in the logframe
- It reflects actual results based on data collected over the year (or the programme period for a final report)
- Confirms if original assumptions in the logframe are still valid and, if not, they have been reformulated
- Report indicates what adjustments, if any, are needed to be keep the programme on track

Exercise: Prepare the essence of your contribution to the next annual report. Summarize the overall results attained and progress made in your respective thematic areas in your current Logical Framework.

Make an outline of what you would include in the Final Report.
Other Uses of RBM as a Monitoring Tool

RBM can be used as a programme management tool in other ways by serving as a basis for:

- Operationalizing Monitoring and Evaluation Plan through on-going collection and tracking of outcome results
- Conducting periodic progress reviews and operational adjustments
  - Identifying and applying lessons learnt
- Developing a programme evaluation or self-assessment

An example of one organization’s best practice in monitoring and reporting was through working with partners. One regional network used the suggested structure for reporting that reflects the Logical Framework developed during the planning phase. This network “developed and used a results-based management (RBM) logframe for reporting and monitoring, in partnership with its members” and that “setting of clear, measurable indicators for all outputs and outcomes … in a participatory manner will ensure that key stakeholders co-create and therefore are party to what the organisation is aiming to achieve. If these are then reported in a manner that makes them readily available in a timely manner, stakeholders will know how well it is doing in meeting its targets.”
Some Suggestions for Successful Monitoring & Reporting

- **Avoid asking for too much data** – keep it simple, relevant, and manageable.
- Monitor both implementation progress in running activities and producing output as well as outcome result achievement
- **Use the Performance Indicators** – they will suggest the evidence necessary to make a convincing case for progress.
- **Define data collection methods early and anticipate how you will store, analyze, and use the data**
- Pilot test the collection process before beginning to collect data to make sure it is realistic.
- **Start to collect data right away** – When you observe a result write it down and collect it throughout the year.
- **Link to outputs** – It is produced as an immediate product or service by the program and is in the control of the entity (e.g., seminars, publications,).
- **Collect data throughout year** and store it using the categories in the logical framework
- **Include anecdotal and narrative information** – it gives a face and human interest side to the story because outcomes are changes in behavior
Section IV: Programme Evaluation: Assessing and Evaluating Programme Results

When you look at the RBM process as a cycle, as seen in the graphic in the Overview, you start with programme planning where you set out a vision for the programme in response to a problem, define results (objectives, outcomes, and outputs), set priorities and determine resource needs.

You then implement the programme. You have learnt that the implementing stage of a programme includes, monitoring performance and reporting progress. During this stage, performance data can be collected and tracked. This is important in its own right but is also the basis for your next phase of the RBM process, evaluation.

Evaluation is an integral part of results-based management. In addition to being of interest to funders and other key stakeholders, good evaluations and self-assessments are important tools for learning over time, making better informed decisions, and becoming more effective. Good evaluations need to build upon the on-going data that have been collected and used before deciding what additional data need to be gathered to get a full picture of the programme’s contribution as a tool for development. The picture that emerges identifies problems, or best practices, to be applied to the next stage of planning and the preparation of new proposals.

The RBM logframe that provides the basis for ongoing efforts to monitor progress also provides the basis for more thorough programme evaluation. It is important that indicators are aligned with those outcomes; they must be practical and consistent part of a larger basis for tracking performance and evaluating results. This provides a more effective management tool as well as the basis for better-informed decisions.

**Point of Focus: Outcome Results**

Programme Evaluation is a systematic approach to:

- Determining what collective “outcome results” have been achieved over time, and
- Identifying the reasons why they have or have not.
- Programme evaluation is a tool that:
  - Better focus and manage programmes (management)
  - Detect and correct problems during implementation
  - Learn lessons for future programing
  - Obtain credible findings about results

Programme Evaluations:

- Complement on-going performance information already gathered through targeted data collection to fill the gaps
- Provide an overall picture of performance results.
Programme evaluations;

- should not be just for donors
- are important tools for learning, adjusting and decision making and becoming more effective lessons learned for organizational development and programme adjustments.

Evaluation focuses on the actual results that have been attained over the duration of the programme. This also includes the programme contribution as a tool for development. The evaluation process provides a focus on strategic outcomes over time and on the question “what” happened – what actual changes occurred as a result (outcome) of the programme intervention?

Using the RBM logframe as critical point of reference, the basis of analysis is in terms of the question “Did anything happen as a result of the research (or training)?” “Did outputs lead to outcomes?” Then, the next focus of an evaluation is “why” things happened or did not happen.

**Types of Evaluations**

Programme evaluation takes several forms:

- **Self-assessments:** Self-assessing evaluations are undertaken the organizations and programmes, of their own work, and are timed to make adjustments. They are sometimes conducted at mid-point and this provides a basis for making necessary adjustments. It further allows for preparing a final report on the programme. The mode for is more informal and less hierarchical.

- **External Evaluations:** These are generally independent evaluations by outsiders contracted by the programme entity as part of funders’ obligations for the assessment.

**Role of Evaluation**

Evaluations usually have two dimensions:

- **Summative:** The summative dimension of the evaluation is undertaken to gauge whether what was expected to happen, happened. It is often used for accountability.

- **Formative:** The formative dimension of the evaluation is undertaken to determine why a particular outcome was obtained, i.e. why, or why not, did something happen? This is generally used for management. Formative evaluation answers the “why” question. This is perhaps more important than the summative, since knowledge obtained from this is what can be applied to current or future programmes.

For example, the evidence from an evaluation of Sida assistance to a university showed that the weakest stage was still the utilization of research results outside the university. While some research programmes had made determined efforts to see that their results were applied, particularly in the water, construction and energy research areas, others had been more concerned with the academic uses of the research. Ensuring that use of the
research results by stakeholders in government and the private sector was identified as a future priority.

Timing:
Evaluations can either be done at the end of a period, or, preferably, at a mid-point. Most organizations undertake an evaluation in the middle of a project or programme or when a renewal or new proposal is being submitted. The purpose of an evaluation is to see what is happening, why it is happening and if the intended results of the intervention are on track to being achieved. If an evaluation is conducted in the middle of the project it allows for enough time to have elapsed to determine whether results are being obtained, and also gives time to the implementers to make any changes that may be deemed necessary to ensure achievement by the end of the programme cycle.

There may special need for an evaluation, particularly if there are questions about the programme’s effectiveness.

What Programme Evaluation Does
The primary rationale for evaluations is that they can determine whether what has been promised is happening. Along with this it reassures funding sources that progress has been made. Evaluation:

- Clarifies the need to measure promises of outcomes. If you can’t measure it, it probably doesn’t exist.
- Gives an incentive to collect results data. If you observe what happens systematically, you have evaluation material
- Can prove what really happened, including causality
- And can identify what makes programmes work

Evaluation combines two concepts: validity (you are measuring what you think you are) and reliability (someone else using the same data collection methods would collect the same data). This is the basis of science and it makes a check on what you are promising. Once you know what and how you have to report, you can build a collection of results data into the normal processes and have the basis for starting evaluations that can show why things happen so that conclusions can be drawn about what works. You can identify those programmes that, however wonderful their objectives, don’t work and either fix the programmes so that they do work, or replace them with something that does.

- Fix what is broken, don’t fix what is not

It is important to remember that the purpose of an evaluation is to make clear what is working and what is not. You may need to make changes based on the results, but only those elements that have not been shown to work.

Four major scenarios
The approach to evaluation depends on why the evaluation is being undertaken. There are four scenarios.

- Improvement in performance: A self-assessment conducted while the project or programme is being executed is a means to diagnose progress and improvements necessary to ensure that expected results are obtained.
Close out: The purpose of this type of evaluation is to effectively complete a project or programme and assess performance, and see whether the intended results were achieved.

Extension or renewal: Programmes often need to be extended or renewed. The evaluation helps make a case for extended funding or additional funding for a new phase.

**Funding Considerations**

Evaluation helps you to:

- Prove the contribution of the programme to stakeholders (e.g. show that scientific research can produce results)
- Eliminate suspicion that funds are not well-spent
- Increase funding opportunities

Showing internal and external results makes the case and helps to determine the outcome. You can:

- Tell your story
- Answer the question “To what end?” Through evaluation results you can show that research partnership:
  - Help make change happen
  - Is a tool for development

**Pre-requisites for conducting the evaluation:**

1. **Participatory open process involving key stakeholders at all stages**

   Based on the genuine belief in people’s participation, it is imperative that you engage all your stakeholders in the process. In fact, the implementing partners are only ones who can collect data and provide on the ground insight

   - The target population is what really matters – a change in behavior is the only meaningful definition of outcomes, and this is what you should be ultimately looking for.

2. **Measurable logical frameworks that can be verified**

   The Logical Framework is both a planning tool, and an evaluation tool. In planning you connect outcomes to outputs: and in evaluation you connect outputs back to outcomes. They are based on an underlying premise of how the intervention is intended to move up the funnel of causality. When this is established in the logframe, you know what to measure and therefore can show plausible causality, assuming the intended outcome did happen as influenced by your outputs (products/services).

   - Measurable terms needed to measure the change results
   - Lack of results focus is usually due to lack of specific problem analysis
   - Clarity leads to agreement
   - Measurable leads to data, and data allows you to
   - “Show the results”
3. Data collection strategy that has been implemented with stakeholders gathering data
   In case there is insufficient data collection, the lack of data is indicative of lack of a participatory process less than optimal data collection strategy. This in turn leads to poor performance reporting due to lack of evidence. There is a need to bridge the gap and build into an on-going process. Lack of stakeholder involvement comes at the cost of collecting data and joint analysis of results.

4. A systematic data collection strategy adjusted to the practicalities of the programme
   This also serves as a basis for evaluation reporting.

A post-requisite

5. Commitment to learning from the evaluation results and applying the lessons learned
   Without a commitment to learn from your mistakes or doing more of what is working well, progress and success will be limited. If the results of your evaluations are not used, you cannot show whether, or how, research cooperation has made an external contribution and that it is more than just academic research. There will be no common basis for deciphering what has happened or why or why not. There will also be little or no basis for agreement of what adjustments should be made to improve performance or to take follow-up measures.

   A first problem examples in planning: to illustrate some of the problems let’s look at an extended example outside the area of Sida funding, drawn from the United Nations.

   This subprogramme of a Programme Budget for 2010-2011, in the programme of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs deals with development policy and analysis. Here is the text of one of their expected accomplishments (which would be called outcomes in other organizations of the System). The objective is fairly clear: this is a programme that is expected to help governments improve their policy decision-making – a classical UN Secretariat research function.
**Objective of the Organization:** To identify and reach intergovernmental agreement on the economic policies and actions necessary at the national and international levels to improve long-term development prospects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected accomplishments of the Secretariat</th>
<th>Indicators of achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Strengthened international debate by assisting the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council in identifying and understanding new and emerging economic development issues and challenges, in particular in the context of advancing the internationally agreed development goals, including the Millennium Development Goals, and with full consideration of the implications of major cross-cutting issues for the international development agenda.</td>
<td>(a) (i) Increased number of debated economic policies and actions to achieve internationally agreed development goals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Performance measures:**

- **2006-2007:** 9 decisions taken by the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council regarding these issues.

- **Estimate 2008-2009:** 10 decisions taken by the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council regarding these issues.

- **Target 2010-2011:** 11 decisions taken by the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council regarding these issues.

The first problem is that the expected outcome can’t be measured. It uses terms like “strengthen” (which can mean either “lift more weights” “take steroids” or “send in more troops” but probably that isn’t what is meant here). The indicators give a better sense of what they think they mean: an increased number of resolutions in the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council. Is that what you really want? You will spend $13 316.9 million to increase the number of resolutions by 1. (The indicators clearly don’t express that).

So, what will the subprogramme do in the future? Here is the text of the outcome in the strategic framework for 2012-2013. Nothing has changed, except to add an additional indicator “increased percentage of Member States responding to surveys that find the report “useful” and “very useful”. This is also a wrong indicator: It doesn’t matter whether governments think they are useful. What counts is that they were used.

A Second Problem Example in results formulation:
What was really meant:

- The real expected outcome was that the reports and analysis would be used by governments and its proper measure would be used.

If we look more carefully at the subprogramme, we can see that it produces analysis that is supposed to be used by governments to shape policies. For that to happen, the output has to be read and then incorporated in decision-making. This can be measured and would demonstrate the utility of the work.

3rd Problem Example - in performance reporting:

Subprogramme 7
Global development trends, issues and policies

(a) Strengthened international debate by assisting the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council in identifying and understanding new and emerging economic issues, in particular in the context of advancing the internationally agreed development goals agreed upon at the major United Nations conferences and summits, including the Millennium Development Goals.

296. The subprogramme’s analytical outputs strengthened the debate in the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council by providing unbiased analyses of development issues and policies. The main outputs in 2008-2009 were the World Economic and Social Surveys; the Reports and Policy Notes of the Committee for Development Policy; the Handbook on the Least Developed Country Category: Inclusion, Graduation and Special Support Measures; the reports of the Millennium Development Goals Gap Task Force; the reports of the Secretary-General on the integration of the economies in transition into the world economy; on unilateral sanctions against developing countries; and on development cooperation with middle-income countries. Their impact was reflected by 28 related resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council. They also served as background materials for discussions of economic development issues in the Assembly, the Council and international conferences, and were cited in related Secretary-General’s reports and notes.
This year the programme performance report basically said that the output “strengthened the debate” (whatever that means) and led to 28 resolutions and decisions. This is weak.

Readiness for Evaluation

Are you ready yet? Basis for the Readiness Test

- How measurable is your RBM Logical framework? If they are not, make the logframe outcomes measurable.
- The logframe is both a planning and an evaluation tool: in planning you connect outcomes to outputs: in evaluation you connect outcomes back to outputs.
- What data have you been collecting in an on-going basis? What evidence do you have to show you are progressing toward achieving those results? How can you collect the data you don’t yet have?
  - Activate the data collection strategy to actually collect and report data against Performance Indicators
  - Collecting and reporting data in an on-going manner.
  - What role have your implementing partners played? Are your key stakeholders participating in the RBM process from design to reporting? Take stock of when and how often you have involved your key partners in RBM process.
    - Identify Key Stakeholder Groups, internal and external
    - Note their relationship to the programme and its component projects
    - Note the extent of their actual involvement in the process and if none, how they should be involved
    - Determine how they might be more active, in what way and to what end
- How might you report the evaluation findings to get better programme results?
  - How useful” it has been in reporting and in relating to key stakeholders. Agree with key stakeholders on the end use of and approach to the Terms of Reference for the Evaluation
    - Discuss and agree in advance for common expectations
    - Joint analysis and determination
    - Managing for results
    - Action Plan for follow-up on recommendations

It affects all in determining the critical question: “To be or not to be?”

Phases of Evaluation

Programme evaluation and self-assessments have four stages each with their own focus:

1. **Plan** the evaluation with development of a Terms of Reference. This is the first stage of the process and it answers the question: What are you going to assess? and How do you define promises in measurable ways?

2. **Conduct:** This is not as easy as it may seem, data collection is a science and data analysis is an art: the process involves a lot of detective work
3. **Report:** Determine what to present: – This is also a tricky business as it involves “politics”. What context do you have to take into account in framing your conclusions and recommendations?

4. **Follow-up** with programme adjustments to ensure the recommendations are consideration and action is taken to follow-up on them.

**Important Considerations for the evaluation process, it should:**

- Involve the target group as participants in the process to hear what they have to say
- Evaluate to learn and to use the results to make adjustment
- Use the evaluation to apply rigor building on the ongoing data collection by complementing it with additional dimensions of results. This makes it a more robust and critical management tool that can be used
- Be practical, don't over reach or overdo the evaluation
- Treat the evaluation in the context of a learning culture and a learning organization. Take a constructive approach to valuation so people are not held to blame but rather your programme becomes more effective

Each of the four stages of evaluation have their own focus elaborated upon further below:

**A. Planning the Evaluation**

The Terms of Reference (ToR) serves as the major planning document for the evaluation. It establishes very clearly at the outset what is to be done in the evaluation, how it will be done, when and who it will be done and with how much resources. It should ensure that each party involved in the evaluation agrees to the objective of the evaluation, the primary issues, the approach and methods to be used as well as the resources and end product to be produced. Care should be taken to ensure they are clear and that they deal specifically with the questions the evaluation are to address. The evaluation should use the RBM Logical Framework established for the programme as its common point of reference.

An integral part of preparing a ToR is you determine what additional data you need to complete a full evaluation.

Starting with where you are now, gather the data currently available,

Identify the gap between what you and implementing partnering have been collecting in an ongoing basis and what other data you still need in order to determine what has actually happened.

Use a new data collection strategy worksheet to determine the best way to obtain that additional data.

Now outline (initially in bullet points) a ToR that will get you the additional data you need to complete an evaluation or self-assessment over the coming (2-3) months. As you specify the particulars into narrative this established the particulars of the evaluation approach – what you are going to do and how you are going to do it during the conduct of the evaluation.
Taking stock of what you already have in terms of performance results data and reflecting it in the ToR enables you to build on your data collection and annual reporting with much lesser effort than would otherwise be possible.

**B. Conducting an Evaluation**

This stage involves collecting and analyzing data. This process brings us the answer to the larger question, “What do we have to know?”

A technique this is to *express each indicator in the form of a question or questions*. For example:

The Performance Indicator “extent of use in policy deliberations” converted into a question would be: “Has the multi-disciplinary research been used in policy deliberations?”

The Performance Indicator “change in number of conference invitations” converted into a question would be “Has there been an positive or negative change in the number of invitations to conferences?”

The Performance Indicator “percent increase in use of research results” converted into a question would be “Has there been an increased use of research results?”

The substance of the evaluation will be finding answers to the questions derived from the official performance indicators. The rest of the planning phase consists of determining how to answer the questions. And, we start by establishing the information acquisition strategy.

**Connect Indicator with Data Source**

Performance indicators tell what information is needed. The performance indicators tell you what information you will need to be able to observe and will point toward the data source where the information can be found.

As we learnt in Section I, the source has to be accessible and practical in the sense that the programme manager can use it. For example, there may be very good data in a confidential national database, but if the organization doing the evaluation cannot have access to it, it is not very useful. Similarly, there might be very good information in a commercial database like Lexus/Nexus, but if it costs money and the organization doesn’t have a subscription, it isn’t realistic to use it.

In deciding on the most appropriate source of data, several things have to be born in mind.

- The data sources have to be *relevant* to the indicators. Reviewing data on rainfall might be interesting and easy, but it will not say much about radiological emissions.
- The data sources have to be *reliable*. It might be easy to get opinions from neighboring farmers about how much radiation a plant produced, but these would not be very reliable.
The analysis of data should reflect two stages of analysis: what happened and why did it or did it not happen.

In terms of what happened (results attained) the evaluation builds on the data collection strategy developed during the planning stage of the evaluation reflected, if necessary, in a refined RBM logical framework, reflecting data:

- acquired in previous years.

In terms of reasons why or why not:

- identify common factors that are inhibiting or facilitating progress and what adjustments should be made to take them into account.
- assess the validity of the Assumptions/risk analysis. Where they have proven not held up, state why and what the revised/new assumptions are and why they are more appropriate.

The data you collect should always be explicitly linked to the intended outcomes. The analytical process should be systematic and provide a coherent approach reflected in the ToR for bringing both programme stakeholders together to properly analyze and understand the data before reporting it. Participatory analysis is a critical ingredient that:

- involves representatives of all key stakeholders, including the target groups and other beneficiaries
- analysis that benefits from people with different perspectives looking at the same collective data
- value in diverse feedback and
- agree on the conclusions and recommendations that ensure a greater chance of being implemented.

The advantage to involving those being evaluated is that they are more likely to use the conclusions and be committed to the results.

C. Reporting Evaluation Results

What is a Result?

- Change over time connected with the project’s output
- No change
- Comparison with a standard
- Comparison with a control group

The two stages of the analysis (previously noted) need to be reflected in the report. The first stage is to determine what happened. Once that is determined we can ask: Why did it happen, or why didn’t it happen.

You also need to indicate causality - the difference has a causal connection to the output, i.e. the difference that you see is caused by the output that was produced. In order to show that the output contributed to the outcome, there has to be some ability to attribute the result to the output. The relationship and time also has to be plausible. Also remember that more than one thing could have caused change, and ask the question: “Would it have happened anyway?”
Results at the Outcome level

Do a Self-Assessment of each Outcome under the Objective:

1. Answer the question what happened?

- Analyze available performance data for each outcome
- Assess actual results
- Identify Outputs produced
- Assess actual Outcomes achieved/progress to-date

Deal with what happened first so you don’t confuse matters. Really it is the most important – certainly to your funding stakeholder! This is the summative aspect of the self-assessment with the focus on results.

- Revisit the Assumptions
- Determine whether it’s an external or internal outcome

This is the formative part of the self-assessment. In this stage you can identify what aspects are promoting, and what are inhibiting success. You can also suggest improvements for the future

3. Identify unanticipated results (if any)

4. Draw conclusions, including

- Overall performance results
- Common factors affecting results
- Lessons learned

Draw conclusions about the Overall Project (or programme) Objective. Don’t jump to the conclusion or recommendations. Do it based on the assessment you made of programme results.

5. Make recommendations, including

- Improvements, and
- What needs to be finalized during the remaining programme period

The structure of an evaluation report is fairly standard:

- Executive Summary
- Introduction explaining the background of the programme
- Methodology followed in the evaluation
- Finding, based on the expected outcomes
- Conclusions, explaining why the findings happened
- Recommendations for future action, including best practices.

Participatory Analysis

The more participatory the process of RBM is, at every stage, the better it is. For best results the process

- involves representatives of all key stakeholders, including target group and beneficiaries
- analysis can benefit from people with different perspectives looking at same data
recognizes the value of diverse feedback.

There are also advantages to involving those being evaluated - greater involvement makes it more likely for them to use conclusions and be committed to results.

**Conclusions & Recommendations**

Criteria for drawing conclusions

- Are the observed results credible?
- Are the causal linkages plausible?
- Can the observed causes be generalized?

Express conclusions clearly.

Make recommendations from them

**D. Post Evaluation Follow-up Action Plan**

To ensure the evaluation results are used, the evaluation process culminates in the development of a Post Evaluation Follow-up Action Plan in which the key program parties indicate how the evaluation results will be used. The Action Plan provides the basis for key stakeholders agreeing upon and implementing the evaluation recommendations. Many organizations, including Sida, make provision for a management response that allows comments on the evaluation findings and recommendations. This can help lead to the development of the Action Plan that should be prepared, based on stakeholder input, following the completion of the evaluation.
What Makes a Good Evaluation?

A. All requisites are fulfilled

- Intervention is assessed against a measurable Logframe
- Outcome results are available over time
- Key stakeholders are part of the process
- Agreement is attained among stakeholders on the evaluation conclusions, recommendations and a follow-up action plan.
- Lessons learned are applied to intervention and shared with others to affect to policy

B. Other criteria:

- Clarity
- Understandable
- Practical and useful
- Timed so can make adjustments
- Process and report were simple and short
- The mode was informal and non-hierarchical

Remember: If you don’t measure results, you can’t tell success from failure. If you can’t see success, you cannot learn from it. If you can’t recognize failure, you can’t correct it. If you can demonstrate results, you can win public and funder support.

Some examples of recommendations made in programme evaluations:

- In the mid-term evaluation of an international programme: In the next donors meeting, programme proposals for research should be *presented with expected outcomes that will demonstrate the likely results of funding the research, in addition to core funding proposals and donors should use these to maintain or increase their funding.*

- At the regional network level, an External Evaluation Report, as carried out from August to October 2011, noted that “Sida’s long term support to WIOMSA has led to the development of a cost effective, agile and very innovative organization that is a well-respected regional leader in promoting a wider move to Western Indian Ocean sustainability” - a conclusion that has led to enhanced reputation and a leadership role for WIOMSA in the Indian Ocean region.

- At the university level, a programme went through a mid-term review this year with the purpose to analyze and assess Sida’s support during 2011-2012. It aimed to offer both a formative and summative evaluation of the programme’s progress, with focus on the future direction and management of its strategic objectives. The review among other things recommended that “the programme should expand and implement systems to more effectively capture the relationship between outputs and outcomes and that should be operationalized in its Monitoring, Learning and Evaluation framework to clarify and document outcomes that lie beyond the programme’s well-documented output indicators, and put in place systems to track the same.”
Some Suggestions for Programme Evaluation

- Involve key stakeholders in developing the Terms of reference for an evaluation or self-assessment.
- Schedule an evaluation so the bulk of it takes place during periods of less activity as long as key stakeholders are available.
- Find out who else is doing an evaluation at the same time and who else is obtaining information from the stakeholders to be mutually reinforcing.
- Make the Terms of Reference short, to the point and focused.
- Complement performance monitoring data with evaluation data to fill the information gaps and help ensure appropriate decisions are made.
- Focus on Outcome Indicators – the substance of the evaluation is the answer to the questions derived from the performance indicators.
- Make a connection between outcome results and outputs to establish a plausible causal connect.
- Collect the observation or evidence to make a convincing case; avoid asking too many questions and pilot test data collection protocols.
- Make a connection between results (what happened) and process (how it was done).
- Think through the analysis plan and the mode of presentation before collection the data.
- Follow leads to explain why results have or have not been obtained.
- Frame conclusions and advance recommendations in an organizational learning context.
- Be sure key stakeholders who participated in the evaluation have an opportunity to see the draft report before it is released to others.
ANNEXES

Annex A: GLOSSARY of TERMS

Assumptions: external factors, outside the control of the programme that must be considered when planning an intervention. They form a part of risk analysis. They are the risks more likely to happen for example (a) whether the government lives up to its obligations and (b) the political situation changes.

Activities: The actions needed to produce outputs.

Annual Report: a comprehensive report on activities throughout the preceding year. Annual reports are intended to give stakeholders and other interested people information about the progress and performance.

Baseline Data: Baseline data is collected at one point in time and is used as a point of reference against which results will be measured or assessed in the future. Many Performance Indicators are based on measuring change and the best way to measure change is to compare the future to the initial situation (the base-line). If it is a new programme, it’s possible a base line does not exist yet, start from zero.

Data Sources: the resources where data can be acquired. A source that specifies where relevant information can be found on performance indicators.

Evaluation: to examine and judge carefully based on acquired data. In addition to being of interest to donors and other key stakeholders, good evaluations and self-assessments are important tools for learning over time, making better informed decisions, and becoming more effective.

External results: (relates to Outcome data) are used outside the research community (university or networks) in the realm of target audiences, such as use of a research degree on the job in private sector, or applied research influences policy agreements in a specific sector.

Formative: (relates to evaluation) the formative dimension of an evaluation is undertaken to determine why a particular outcome was obtained, i.e. why, or why not, did something happen. Generally used for management. Often considered more important than the summative, since knowledge obtained from this is what can be applied to current or future programmes.

Indicators: what is measured or observed to verify an outcome (change) has happened, and to gauge progress.

Inputs: resources provided to an intervention- the resources utilized to conduct activities.
Internal results: (relate to Outcome data) uses made within a university setting (academia) or research institute, such as advanced degrees received, obtaining a job because of the degree, or getting a research paper published in a peer reviewed journal.

Logical Framework/ Logframe: an analytical tool used to plan, monitor, and evaluate projects. It derives its name from the logical linkages set out by the planner(s) to connect a project’s means with its ends.

Monitoring: the regular observation and recording of activities taking place in a project or programme. A process of routinely gathering information on all aspects of a project to check on how they are progressing. It is a means of assessing whether promises are being kept and establishes a track record that outcomes are happening.

Objective: An overall desired achievement involving a process of change to meet certain needs of identified beneficiaries within a given period of time. Objective is the end-state to be achieved by a certain date that ameliorates a problem. It is the aim or role of an organization. Objectives are strategic and the “accumulation” of outcome results which there is no control over but lie in the sphere of influence.

Outcomes: the changes that must happen during a plan period to achieve an objective. Outcomes are what an intervention is supposed to make happen. They are the likely or achieved short and medium term effects of an intervention’s outputs. Second highest-level concept in results-based management, outcomes are outside your control because they are dependent on others outside the programme

Outcome Data: the primary focus during the monitoring process together with outputs, which have a clear and plausible link to those outcomes. There are two kinds: Internal results and External results.

   (1) Internal results are uses made within the university setting (academia) or research institute, such as advanced degrees received, obtaining a job because of the degree, or getting a research paper published in a peer reviewed journal; and

   (2) External results are used outside the research community (whether university or networks) in the realm of target audiences or users for application or use, such as use of research degree on the job in private sector, or applied research influences policies in a specific sector.

Outputs: The products, capital goods and services, which result from a development intervention. What is produced or provided by a programme or project and are under the organization’s control (e.g., seminars, publications, PhD degrees).

Performance Indicators: Pointers that help an organization define and measure progress toward the organizational goals expressed as outcomes. How to observe and measure whether an outcome has happened.

Problem: a matter or situation regarded as unwelcome or harmful and needing to be dealt with and overcome. The situation or conditions to be addressed for a specific target group and changed (resolved or ameliorated) together by a programme intervention.
**Programme Evaluation:** the organization demonstrates its results and learns from the experience.

**Programme Monitoring and Reporting:** the organization produces the output that should make the outcomes (changes) happen and reports on it.

**Programme Planning:** an organization makes promises about the results it will achieve to solve a problem

**Reliability:** (relates to data collection strategy) the extent to which an experiment, test, or measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials. An attribute of any system that consistently produces the same results.

**Reporting:** enables the gathered information to be used in making decisions for improving project performance. Reporting is an integral part of an organization’s ongoing operations and helps in decision-making and organizational learning.

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

**Results-Based Management:** (RBM) a strategic management approach. A programme management cycle that plans, implements, monitors and measures the changes from an intervention, rather than just the inputs provided or activities conducted. It is an approach that focuses on the end results (outcomes). Starting with the target population and asking questions – such as “to what end?” “what change do we want to see?” and “how we will know and show if we have achieved the outcomes we set out to achieve?” – RBM focuses on the entire programme management cycle.

**Risk analysis:** the process of defining and analyzing the dangers to individuals, businesses and government agencies posed by potential natural and human-caused adverse events.

**Stakeholder:** someone (or some institution) that either is affected by a problem, would benefit from its solution, or is essential to solving the problem.

**Summative:** (relates to evaluation) the summative dimension of the evaluation is undertaken to gauge whether what was expected to happen, happened. It is often used for accountability.

**Target group:** groups and/or individuals that are beneficiaries and intermediaries that an intervention will focus on or with whom the organization will need to work.

**Validity:** (relates to data collection strategy) the extent to which data is well grounded, sound, and defensible; to show no inconsistency or deficiency when put to the test. Containing premises from which the conclusion may logically be derived.
Annex B: TEMPLATES, FORMS AND OTHER TOOLS

This annex contains tools that are central to the RBM approach and those that are complementary:

- **Critical Questions to Ask in Developing a Results-Based Logical Framework** – a discussion guide to facilitating plenary sessions and small groups in formulating their logical framework.
- **Results-based Management Logical Framework** – as used for programme planning during the first phase of the RBM cycle.
- **Data Collection Strategy** – a worksheet for determining what outcome data is to be collected, how, when and by who.
- Suggested **Annual Report Structure** – suggested reporting structure, with modified RBM Logframe adapted to focusing on two key results: outputs and outcomes with minimal effort in transposing formats, as basis for an Annual Report.
- **Field Visit Data Collection Worksheet** – a means for recording data and observations while in the field
Annex B.1

Critical Questions to Ask in Developing a Results-based Logical Framework
Discussion guide for Facilitation of plenary sessions or small work groups

The key to Results-Based Management (RBM) is knowing what questions to ask. The substance of results-oriented logical frameworks flow from the answers to those critical questions (below). Answers to the questions, jointly arrived at through an open process that engages key stakeholders, provide the basis for formulating a meaningful results-oriented logical framework. The purpose of this discussion guide is to think beyond the present in results-terms as partner entities brainstorm and develop RBM Logical Frameworks.

Critical questions related to key RBM Concepts comprising the elements of a results-oriented Logical Framework are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key RBM Concepts</th>
<th>Critical Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Reference Points for getting started | Initial questions:  
  - Do you have a plan? Are you going to use that as the point of reference? OR is this a forward think of a new or evolving role in the future?  
  - What is the time frame for the Logical Framework?  
  - Is the Logframe to reflect only Sida-supported activities or all activities funded also by other sources?  
    - Where is your organization going? What is your role or vision of the future? How does the programme fit into that context?  
  Leading generic questions:  
    - Why do you want to do that? What is the problem you are addressing?  
    - What’s supposed to happen? What is the end-state by the end of the period?  
    - What do you mean by this statement? |
| Specific Questions related to each of the respective elements of the RBM Logical Framework: |  
  - What is the issue or research gap to be addressed by the research funded programme?  
    - How can research as an intervention help make a difference in helping contribute to the solution?  
    - When the problem is broken down, what are the contributing factors that you can influence? What is the specific problem your programme will address in the next x years?  
      - What level of the problem can you reasonably affect so you don’t shoot too high?  
      - What are the pieces of the bigger problem your intervention can help change?  
    - What are the key cause(s) of the problem your programme will address? |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Key RBM Concepts</strong></th>
<th><strong>Critical Questions</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ✓ Is the problem specific enough – broken down enough – so you know what has to happen?  
✓ Is it specific enough so you know what has to happen in terms of results?  
• What is your summary problem statement for your application? |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Overall Objective</strong></th>
<th><strong>end-state</strong> to be achieved over the longer term that ameliorates the problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • What do you expect to happen? To what end?  
   ➢ What will you see as a result in successfully addressing the problem?  
• What is the overall change you expect to happen as a result of your programme?  
   ➢ By when do you expect to see it happen?  
• What is your Overall Objective statement?  
   ➢ Is it the converse of the summary Problem Statement – i.e., a positive statement in the change of the condition or situation noted in the PSS? |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Specific Objective</strong></th>
<th><strong>end-states</strong> to be achieved over the shorter term that are needed to achieve the Overall Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • What specific change(s) do you expect to see?  
• By when?  
• What is your Specific Objectives?  
   ➢ Are they part of the funnel of causality in the chain of logic between the Overall objective and the outcomes?  
   ➢ Are they a couple of outcomes away from the outputs but no so far away as to not be able to show your intervention contributed to the change? |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Outcomes</strong></th>
<th><strong>changes</strong> necessary to achieve the Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • What do you expect to see as a change in the current situation or [conduction]??  
   ➢ By when?  
• What are the changes the programme will help make happen?  
• What are your expected (intended) outcomes (changes that will happen) as a result of your programme?  
   ➢ What is [to be] done with your Output?  
   ➢ What happens with your Output? Who (what is the target group) does what with it?  
   ➢ Who will use the outputs? How do they use it?  
   ✓ Are the outcomes measurable and do they meet the SMART criteria? |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Performance Indicators</strong></th>
<th><strong>Measures</strong> as signs of progress towards the Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • How will you know you have achieved or are achieving the intended outcomes?  
   ➢ What evidence (data) will you need to determine whether you are making progress in attaining the outcomes?  
   ➢ What evidence (data) will you need to show your programme has had its intended results? ?  
• How can you measure (verified) the Outcomes?  
   ➢ Given what you’ve promised as outcomes in logframe, how you are going to verify them – i.e., how can you
### Key RBM Concepts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) measure (verify) that the promises are being met?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What kind of evidence do you need to demonstrate the Outcome happened? What are the data you have to collect data? What kind of data do you have now?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What is your single most important Performance Indicator for each outcome?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Did you specify the Performance Indicators for which you are going to collect data on, where and how you are going to get the data?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Output

**Provided as a product or service**

- Is the Output something you produce? Is it something you control?
- What specific outputs need to be provided to help make the outcome (changes) happen?
  - By when?
- What happens with your output?
  - What do your outputs lead to?
  - What changes result (in part) because of your output?
- What is the *causal link* between the Output(s) and Outcomes? (the contribution)
  - Are the outputs measurable?

### Activities* done to produce Outputs

- What are your main activities* that lead to the output?

### Inputs* resources to conduct activities

- What are the necessary inputs* needed to undertake the activities?

### Assumptions conditions external to programme that must be considered

- What are the critical assumptions underlying your proposal to supporting the national counterpart Universities?
  - What are the risks that are more likely to happen?
- Indicates that these are not necessarily set forth in the RBM Logframe but rather in an Annual Operational Plan that reflects the Logframe.
1. Suggested Results-based Management Logical Framework Template

[Program Title]

Results-Based Management Logical Framework: 20xx-20yy

Date First Prepared:  
Date Revised:  

1. Summary Problem Statement:  
2. Overall Objective:  
3. Specific Objectives 1:  
   Specific Objective 2:  
   Specific Objective 3:  
   Specific Objective 4:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Outputs</th>
<th>Outcomes (including targets)</th>
<th>Performance Indicator of Outcome (if/as established)</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Data collection strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Specific Objective # 1:  

• 1.1  

• 1.2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Outputs</th>
<th>Outcomes (including targets)</th>
<th>Performance Indicator of Outcome (if/as established)</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Data collection strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assumptions (for Specific Objective):

Specific Objective # 2:

| •                | 2.1                          |                                                      |             |                        |
| •                | 2.2                          |                                                      |             |                        |

Assumptions (for Specific Objective):
Guidance for this Results-Based Management Logical Framework matrix (Template)

It is important to note that the overall logframe of a programme/an institution is sometimes derived from more detailed logframes developed by e.g., faculties, departments, research groups, students (working for a bigger objective). Other times such logframes are derived from one programme with a defined and narrow objective.

Specific guidance:

This model of the logical framework consists of three different levels of results: Objective, outcome and outputs. Focus is on outcomes, particularly those with close and intermediate time frames.

- **Outputs** are close to outcomes so you know what to measure and can show causality.
- Focus is on **outcomes**, particularly those with close and intermediate time frames.
- The (singular) **Performance Indicator** associated only with the outcome to show whether each outcome has been obtained.
- **Baseline data** is collected at one point in time and is used as a point of reference against which results will be measured or assessed in the future. If not available at the start of the programme, Sida allows the baseline to be established during the first year.
- The **source** where the data can be obtained
- **Data collection strategy** including how the data will be obtained and analyzed
- **Assumptions** (a row at the bottom of each Specific Objective) are those considerations (factors) in the external environment that are not controllable or subject to influence that need to be in place if the results are to be achieved.

As you see, there isn’t a lot of room in the columns: keep it simple and short. A premium is placed on thinking, not writing nor verbiage.
2. Data Collection Strategy Worksheet

Data Collection Strategy Worksheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Data Collection Method</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guidance for Data collection Strategy Worksheet:

1. Fill in the columns for each of the columns:
   - Performance Indicator
   - Source of data
   - Collection Method
   - Who is responsible for collecting it,
   - When they will collect it

Agree on the Data collection Strategy – commit to collecting the data and helping bring it to the team.

Now go back and revise the draft RBM Logframe as needed.
3. Suggested Annual Report Structure

Name of Programme:
Name of Responsible Coordinator:
Contact Information:
Date of submission:

Executive summary

I. Introduction/Context
[State the planned results, objectives, outcomes including targets and outputs as established in the RBM Logframe, cross referencing annual targets in the Annual Operational Plan where it exists.]

II. Actual Progress toward Results
[Describe the major results, focusing on outcomes and outputs, including targets, for the performance period, cross referencing annual targets in the Annual Operational Plan where they exist. These may include any unexpected result(s) that you find important or indicative and wish to highlight.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested Annual Report: Progress towards Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of problem statement (1 sentence max.)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Objective:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Outputs expected (including targets)</th>
<th>Outcomes expected</th>
<th>Performance indicator of outcomes</th>
<th>Outcome results observed in year</th>
<th>Outputs produced in year to obtain outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specific Objective 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assumptions

III. Summarizing Analysis – reasons for results and examples
[Comparing planned results with the achieved results for the period covered, explain the reasons why they were or weren’t not achieved, noting delays, obstacles, assumptions or other influencing factors.]

IV. Summary of Conclusions and Recommendations
[Note conclusions made and measures to be taken to adjust the programme.]

Enclosures:
RBM Framework Annual Report for 20xx

In preparing for reporting, it is always helpful to fill out observed results I the logframe, as well as the outputs that are connected to them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Outcomes (including targets)</th>
<th>Performance Indicator of Outcome</th>
<th>Outcome Results Observed in year</th>
<th>[Key] Outputs produced in year to obtain outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Specific Objective 1:

1.1.

1.2

1.3
Guidance for Suggested Annual Report Structure:

For the organization as a whole and for each of the component, project or thematic areas (if they exist), the partner entity’s Annual Progress Report should relate to the objectives, expected outcomes and the indicators. It should also show the outputs produced according to those results in the approved RBM Logical Framework in order to apply clear, simple and consistent reporting standards focusing on the results of the program.

Definitions of objectives, outcomes and outputs below:

*Objective/impact* – What the intervention aims at achieving in the long run. Achieving the objective constitutes impact.

*Outcomes* – What are the likely or achieved short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention’s outputs that are outside the control of the intervention (e.g. changes in policies or/and practices, articles published in international academic peer-reviewed journals) intended to lead to the achievement of the objective.

*Output* – What is produced by an intervention that is in the control of the partner organisation. (e.g., seminars, publications, PhD degrees)

Overall: In responding to specific sections of the Annual Report, follow the narrative guidance in brackets under the respective heading of each section of the Annual Report Outline.

1. Since the annual reports need to be based on RBM logframes that are measurable and Performance Indicators, use the RBM logframe previously developed and approved.

2. Focus on outcomes – those achieved as well as progress toward outcomes not yet fully attained – and the key outputs to be produced during the performance year that provide data is linked to the intended outcomes. The outputs may have been further specified established in the annual operational plan.
   - Focus is on outcomes, particularly those with close and intermediate time frames.
   - Note the performance indicators are associated only with the outcome. They show whether each outcome has been obtained.
   - Outputs may have been further specified established in an annual operational Plan and can show causality

3. The implementing partners should gather the data on accomplishments and the supported entity classifies the diverse outcomes into their proper narrative text.

4. Using the slightly modified RBM logframe whereby the last 3 columns are adapted into two columns, labeled “Outcome Results Observed in the Year” and “Key Outputs in year to Obtain Outcomes.” This makes the reporting process quite easy and allows the RBM logframe to serve the dual purpose of the programme management (i.e. for programme planning) and programme reporting and a tool of accountability to donor organizations and stakeholders.
   - As you see, there isn’t a lot of room in the columns: keep it simple and short. A premium is on brevity.
   - The RBM Logical Framework also has a row called “assumptions” which are those things in the external environment that are not controllable or subject to influence that need to be in place if the results are to be achieved. To the extent they need to be modified, indicate that in the Section 3: Summary Analysis.

5. Write so that a lay (outsider) audience can understand rather than to a tight group of scientists. Put the report into terms the non-scientist can grasp without watering down basic RBM concepts.
4. Field Visit Data Collection Recording Worksheet

Field visits are an important management tool, but they are also an excellent source of data. To make full use of the experience, in advance of the visit, the staff member should prepare a data collection worksheet, showing the expected outcomes that could be observed at the visit site. Then, after the field visit, the staff member should fill in the results that were observed and these should then be added to the database for the programme.
Annex C. EXERCISES

Consider the exercises annex as your workbook. It is recommended that you create it as a separate document that you can fill out as suggested in the Handbook.

1. Exercises Section II - Programme Planning

Define the problem that your programme or organization is trying to solve.

Proceed to fill out the table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name the problem</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>List the causes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine stakeholders and actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write a Summary Problem Statement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fill out your Objective/s in the space provided for Specific Objectives. While drafting your objective/s, remember to follow the basic steps outlined in the Objectives segment of Section II

Results-Based Management Logical Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Outputs</th>
<th>Outcomes (including targets)</th>
<th>Performance Indicator of Outcome</th>
<th>Baseline (if established)</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Data Collection Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specific Objective 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assumptions
Fill out your Outcomes in the space provided for them. Remember to follow the SMART and other criteria while drafting them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Outputs</th>
<th>Outcomes (including targets)</th>
<th>Performance Indicator of Outcome</th>
<th>Baseline (if established)</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Data Collection Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specific Objective 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assumptions

Then, see if they pass the three-point test:

Three tests for an outcome:

(4) Does it lead to the objective?
(5) Is it measurable (verifiable)?
(6) Does it have a plausible causal connection to the output (explained below), at least as a contributing factor?

Fill out your Outputs that you expect to have, in the space provided for them. Remember that they are what activities produce and help induce the intended outcome (changes).

Results-Based Management Logical Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Outputs</th>
<th>Outcomes (including targets)</th>
<th>Performance Indicator of Outcome</th>
<th>Baseline (if established)</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Data Collection Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specific Objective 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assumptions
Insert the performance indicators that will show that your outcomes are being achieved in the space provided for them. Remember it is preferable to have 1 indicator per outcome.

**Results-Based Management Logical Framework**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Outputs</th>
<th>Outcomes (including targets)</th>
<th>Performance Indicator of Outcome</th>
<th>Baseline (if established)</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Data Collection Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specific Objective 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assumptions

Look at each outcome and ask:

- Does the indicator answer the question: “did the change happen?”
- Does it relate to the outcome?
- Can data be found that will measure it?
- Can data be found at a reasonable cost?

Insert the base line data for each indicator in your logframe.

Take a look at the logframe you have created in your workbook. Does it meet the requirements for a good logframe? Does it satisfy the key uses of the logframe in your programme planning stage?
2. Exercises: Section III: Programme Implementation: Monitoring & Reporting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator in RBM Logframe</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Data Collection Method</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exercise III.

Using the Data Collection Strategy, for each performance indicator determine:

1. Data to be collected
2. Source(s) of data
3. Method of collection
4. Who should collect the data
5. When to collect data

Prepare the essence of your contribution to the next annual report. Summarize the overall results attained and progress made in your respective thematic areas in your current Logical Framework.

Make an outline of what you would include in the Final Report.
3. Exercises: Section IV: Programme Evaluation: Assessing and Evaluating Programme Results

Plan the evaluation: Develop the Terms of Reference.

Look at the TOR. Does it answer the questions:

i. What are you going to assess? and
ii. How do you define promises in measurable ways?

Conduct the evaluation (This is not as easy as it may seem, data collection is a science and data analysis is an art: the process involves a lot of detective work.)

Reporting: Determining what to present: – It should include facts that are clear, conclusions that follow from the facts and recommendations that take into account the programme’s context and politics.

Follow-up and programme adjustments to ensure the recommendations are considered and action is taken to follow-up on them.