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NOTE TO THE READER

This document has been prepared to support LLS participant (IUCN officers, partners and communities representatives) in implementing a Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation system as a central part of LLS implementation.

As the document systematizes an on-going process, you may be aware of most of the text. Use your criteria about which section to read, according to your needs at different moments. The whole document is long, but you can go to the section you need. Then, it will be just few pages!

Because LLS is an adaptive management programme planning, reflection, implementing and all activities are not sequential, but, in practice, constantly reinforced and adjusted. Therefore the PM&E guidelines are also not fully sequential.
Introduction

This document is an updated version of the “Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (PM&E) Guidelines for Learning and Adaptive Management in LLS Geographic Component and Landscapes” that LLS produced in September 2008. It reflects LLS experience in applying the PM&E methodology up to September 2009. As in the case of the previous version, it should be considered a framework or roadmap rather than a prescriptive document.

The approach in mind is one of “change”....

The IUCN Forest Conservation Programme wants to move from remaining in monitoring activities and outputs towards a more comprehensive M&E of positive changes that will add value and foster empowerment at the local level. The intent is for our various constituencies to capture learning through monitor and evaluate change (and the process to make it possible). We want also at higher level to influence donor thinking and practice.

This approach is focused more on learning than on accountability (i.e. reporting activities and outputs and linear planning). This is because LLS works in a complex and dynamic environment where it is often extremely difficult to design linear, straightforward intervention strategies. Project executants may not know how best to bring about an appropriate change of direction. The circumstances often require testing a number of different strategies and using PM&E to learn about what works best, and when.

....through action-learning

Testing of assumptions or hypotheses requires more than simply gathering data/information about pre-determined information needs. We need to look not only at planned interventions and expected outcomes, but also to of unintended changes; focusing on the “why” rather than the “what” and the future rather than the present. Reflection through an action-learning approach will be key here: dialogue and forum to discuss the landscape and the intervention outcomes (including side-outcomes, positive and negative) and listening to all voices.

PM&E is outcome-based
This means that PM&E will be oriented to understand changes in the behavior, relationships, skills, awareness, knowledge and attitudes of the landscape’s or GC’s stakeholders, even those changes not necessarily directly caused by the LLS intervention. The PM&E should be guided by – but not limited to – the 8 Strategic Outcomes (and their corresponding local Sub-outcomes) that are embedded in the LLS workplans. These Strategic Outcomes are not global targets written in stone, but they establish the scale of the ambitions set out in LLS and are intended to influence thinking and behavior. While we must strive to contribute to the global outcomes, it is not expected that in the very diverse landscape portfolio in which we work that we will achieve all the outcomes in all places: approaches will differ. However, it is critically important to demonstrate what is
being done, what and how is being achieved and, and what is being learned. It is vital not to think of outcomes only in terms of numbers!

A final clarification

This document has been prepared to provide support to PM&E with local stakeholders as the primary ones. The participatory character of the exercise should not avoid the need to demonstrate rigor and reliability. The credibility of the PM&E outside the landscape or GC is based on having the capacity to verify that the information used is reliable in terms of how it has been obtained, (i.e. identification of sources and methods and triangulation of sources or cross-checking). Local PM&E practitioners should be prepared to demonstrate to external evaluators not only what they have learned, but also the rigor and robustness of the process.

This document encompasses 7 sections plus Annexes. After this introduction, Purposes of the PM&E and principles are introduced. Then the Theory of change (ToC) is described, in particular how you can produce the landscapes ToC. After that, the methodology to apply the ToC during implementation is discussed in terms of M&E questions, information needs; and the data collection and processing to answer the M&E questions. A discussion about how to reflect and reporting from the M&E data follows; and finally the integration of all elements in the M&E Plan.

Last, but not least, 5 Annexes include a glossary, examples of M&E products from the field and templates and a list of useful resources (Internet based mainly)

Stephen Kelleher
Deputy Head, IUCN Forest Conservation Programme
Coordinator, Livelihoods and Landscapes Strategy
1. **PM&E Purpose and Principles**

   The overall LLS goal is “the effective implementation of national and local policies and programmes that leverage real and meaningful change in the lives of rural poor, enhance long-term and equitable conservation of biodiversity and ensure the sustainable supply of forest-related goods and services in line with nationally-defined priorities.”

   This document should be read with the Livelihoods and Landscapes Strategic Overview and Operational Components documents. PM&E, along with planning and knowledge management, is part of an integrated methodological approach to achieve LLS goals framed in its eight Strategic Sub-Outcomes.

   The PM&E system has four overall purposes:
   
   a. Management of the LLS Strategy in close collaboration with partners and the local population.
   
   b. Learning with (not around) the local population and key stakeholders (including men and women) at different levels within the landscapes and GCs as well as with the other GCs.
   
   c. Empowerment of the local people and partners in the field so that they own and contribute to the field of development and conservation.
   
   d. Accountability upward (to the donor), and downward (to the people we are working with).

- **PM&E Principles**

  1. **Be flexible for adaptation in different contexts**: the global PM&E guidelines have to be locally adapted to the landscape’s stakeholders needs.

  2. **Be iterative, with regular and periodic assessment** of the process in particular for learning and adaptation (this is embedded in action-learning cycles).

  3. **Be analytical**: focus on the “why?” and “so what?” rather than in the activities or direct results/outputs

  4. **Use a longer term perspective** than the LLS timeframe of 4 years in terms of local PM&E strategy.

  5. **Be relevant and useful for stakeholders**: empowering and building capacity among local communities and partners when doing M&E.

---

1 IUCN Forest Conservation Programme “Livelihoods & Landscapes, leverage programme to catalyze the sustainable use and conservation of forest biodiversity and ecosystem services for the benefit of the rural poor” 2006 Gland (unpublished)
6. **Be outcome-oriented**: PM&E does not focus on the level of each activity or deliverable itself but on how the local population, LLS partners and other stakeholder activities achieve - or do not achieve - changes within the LLS outcomes and beyond. What was the process to achieve an outcome and how and why did it happen in such way?

7. **Not to be “target driven”**: At the end of the day, learning and policy changes matter. Outcomes are “vision statements” or hypotheses against which LLS performs. Targets are thus tools or means of learning rather than mandatory achievements. The issue is to understand what happened and what did not happen, rather than demonstrating that targets or milestones were met as planned.

8. **Define M&E questions and information needs at local/national levels** but useful for different audiences.

9. **Integrate your M&E activities with the implementation activities**: implementation and M&E are two faces of the same coin. LLS is a learning initiative. To learn you need reflection based on evidence. PM&E activities provide the basis for this.
2. The Theory of change for planning, monitoring and evaluation

LLS is an outcome-oriented initiative focuses on influencing positive changes in behaviors, relationships, knowledge and skills and attitudes of the landscape’s stakeholders and sub-national and national levels. To monitor these changes and understand how are being/have been achieved or not; a first step is to define the expected changes and the strategy to arrive to them (even though, these elements may evolve as they are not “written on stone”).

We follow a 4 steps planning process: 1) situation analysis, 2) visioning, 3) strategic plan synthesized in a Theory of change built on shared understanding of key stakeholders, IUCN playing the facilitator role; and 4) annual workplan. The ToC and the workplan are reviewed in a semi-annual base to learn and adapt.

**Graph 1. The LLS Planning and Implementation process**

![Graph 1. The LLS Planning and Implementation process](image)

Few conceptual aspects before moving to describe the formulation methodology…

- Factors to consider when selecting changes to be influenced by LLS: the selection of the changes, in which we will work is determined by a combination of different elements (Sayer J. in LLS 2009) that include the following ones:

1. A facilitated multi-stakeholder process (i.e. speaking to people you do not like)
2. Understanding of past changes
3. Use visualization as a first approach to understand the values of the landscape and exploring scenarios
4. Facilitated negotiation of trade-offs between conservation and livelihoods
5. Driven by outcomes and not reacting to threats
6. Combination of a long perspective (10-15 years?) and the 4 years LLS life
• Impacts, outcomes, annual and 4 years results: which ones refers to changes? In the international development and conservation fields three terms usually refer to changes in the landscape and the livelihood of the local population: 1) outcomes: more immediate changes and 2) impacts: long term more significant ones: Both are also named together as results. In IUCN we use the generic term Result for outcome and Annual Result for output.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IUCN</th>
<th>LLS</th>
<th>Most common</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result</td>
<td>Strategic outcome</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-result</td>
<td>Sub-outcome/Local outcome</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual result</td>
<td>Annual Result</td>
<td>Output/Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Comparative terminology for change

The difference among terms is many times a matter of emphasis, others just different institutions’ preferences. The limits between outcome and impact are also not always so precise. Then, to avoid this very technical discussion about jargon, LLS approach refers, conceptually, to outcome and impacts, sub-result, result and impact; all of them as changes. And we work to influence positive change.

• The ToC names one tool under different approaches or emphasis

LLS follow the approach summarized by Hettie Walters (10-13:2007). A Theory of change is a coherent set of ideas that describes: what the change should be, how a change process occurs, what makes it happen, what has to happen for the intended result/ outcome to be reached, who needs to be involved, whose interests are at stake, and what the result/ outcome of a change process should be. It is basically a road map in the change process that starts by a participatory process with communities, government, NGOs and other LLS partners to provide a foundation in the long term change processes (i.e. further than the 4 years life of LLS.

A theory of Change approach has some similarities with the Logical framework, but it is different in that it seeks to describe at each and every level of the theory chain why one outcome leads to the other and why one activity will lead to an intended outcome/ result. In a theory of change approach the assumptions underlying the internal logic or causal links chain need to be examined and tested.

The ToC conceptually apply a chain of results affected by external factors (see below graph x), similar to logical framework; but the ToC unpacks many elements that the Logical framework matrix hides; it makes possible to see the feedback loops among different elements of the intervention, and reinforce the use of the tool for learning rather than for accountability.
Graph 2. The results chain

It is important to make explicit that the ToC is a dynamic tool that may be adjusted through periodic review in reflection meetings. As the landscape is dynamic, so is the ToC.

We won’t go further to discuss the ToC origin and development. This is out of the scope of this document.

- How does it look the ToC tool?

The ToC in LLS is expressed by two complementary means: a causal map as a graphic presentation and a short text that describes the graphic presentation. The “causal map” (with the logical model as an antecedent) is one of different ways to do it. You may use multiple ways as far as they are comprehensive and readable for others.

The causal map (that has some similarities to the “problems tree” tool) should represent a dynamic process. There are no layers (in the sense of the lowest layer the activities, then the outputs and after that the outcomes). While conceptually it expresses the results chain (from activities to higher level changes or impact), in practical terms the chain components appear at different levels trying to build a more realistic proxy of what happens (see some examples below).

Four elements are included in the ToC: the changes/outcomes, the outputs, the activities and the external factors. All linked by arrows that could have one or two directions. In fact, there are multiple possibilities of connections, but no elements can be left without connection at least to one element in one direction as it can be seen below.

---

2 For background information about ToC and its differences and commonalities with Logical framework you can check Clark and Anderso 2004, Guijt 2007 and Walter 2007 and additional references in the portal of Wageningen Institute. All documents are cited in Annex IV.

3 See for instance the Kellogg Foundation Logical model handbook in
   www.wkkf.org/default.aspx?tabid=101&CID=281&CatID=281&ItemID=2813669&NID=20&LanguageID=0

---
Local government regulation encourage sustainable NRM through CBFM, sustainable practices for industry, spatial planning process.

Kaimana spatial plan balances economic development and environmental protection.

Policies for CBFM/pro-community forest management protect community rights to natural resources.

Lessons from pilot villages used as a basis for district planning process.

Kaimana communities participate in spatial planning process.

Kaimana spatial plan balances economic development and environmental protection.

Lessons from pilot villages used as a basis for district planning process.

Kaimana communities participate in spatial planning process.

Area to be managed for CBFM is delineated within the district spatial plan.

Legal map defining area for models of pro-community forest management agreed by Government.

Community awareness on environmental issues and importance of the spatial planning process for their livelihoods.

Area to be managed for CBFM is delineated within the KPH register map (or other category - village forest? HKM?)

Awareness campaign to disseminate information.

If there are no private or political interests strong enough to prevent monitoring and enforcement of the spatial plan.

If there is no change in national forestry policies which has a negative affect on the project.

Working group provide recommendations on how CBFM/pro-community forestry can be accommodated in spatial planning regulations.

It is a recommendation of the area which should be designated for CBFM/pro-community forestry in 3 sub-districts (Buruway, Kambrau, Arguni Atas).

If community agree that a portion of their land is designated for CBFM or pro-community forestry.

Local government staff prepare position statement on how regulations can be applied in Kaimana.

Series of meeting with sub-district governments, communities to discuss and select model (connect to SFM SToC).

Mapping of the clan [=suku] traditional area boundaries on maps/satellite images with important points surveyed.

Cost-benefit analysis of different models of timber trade (from SFM SToC).

Analysis of forest cover to identify areas of potential for CBFM.

Analysis of special autonomy policies and dissemination of the relevant sections (on CBFM, industry) to all stakeholders (government, private sector, community).

Outcomes/Changes

Outputs/Products

Activities

External factors: “If…”

Outcomes/Changes

Outputs/Products

Activities

Graph 3. Bomberai landscape, Papua/Indonesia Sub Theory of Change 3 of Spatial planning
In this area adequate forest resources remain, but are not used effectively for community development, and are under immediate threat of conversion to oil palm and industrial timber plantation. Thus the overall change which is to be brought about is ‘forest biodiversity and ecosystem services maintained whilst maximizing benefits for local livelihoods’ whilst the key changes needed to achieve this are appropriate planning of industrial development in the area, development of a viable community based forest industry, both supported by district Government development and spatial policies.

Developing a viable community based forest industry requires the development of appropriate capacity (for timber and non-timber management by communities), securing legal rights to the forests and to exploit them, and securing access to a market and long term business development funding.

The appropriate planning of industrial development in the area needs to start by identifying the position and priorities of the communities themselves, and then accommodating these priorities within spatial and district development plans. Communities will have a key role to play as industrial development proceeds by monitoring that it is done according to the agreed plans. However the capacity of local government to enforce the agreed plans will also be key.

The securing of separate areas for forest management to take place is divided into a separate ToC because of it fundamental importance. The process involves identification with communities of land to be maintained for community forest management or agriculture.
As a trend –but not as a rule- under the core change/outcome, you will have activities and outputs and over it various outcome and impacts. External factors will be presented all through the graph. The “If…” are always connecting one card with other (activity to output or output to outcome and so on).

The text is useful in complementing the graph to facilitate communication to those not good to read/understand easily a causal map. It provides the possibility for the actors that developed the map to put in black and white the interpretation of the map. By sharing the text with all participants involved in its design, it can be checked and adjusted to assure that all parties involved do agree on what the ToC is expressing. In addition, this will be useful to explain the intervention in proposals, presentations, etc.

3. **LLS planning through building a ToC**

3.1. **The ToC and the strategic planning**

The ToC helps to refine our strategic interventions to revise our strategic thoughts, assuming that a strategic analysis has been done beforehand. The ToC acts as the link between, on one had, strategic planning and, on the other hand, operational planning (work plan) and implementation/M&E.

The changes that will be planned through various clearly articulated sub-ToCs should have been pre-identified through the strategic planning. For it, you can use different methodologies and tools: situational analysis, visioning, SWOT, sustainable livelihood analysis, modeling, among many. In LLS one of the most used, mainly in Africa has been is the visualization mapping: to make the local communities and other stakeholders to draw a map of their perceived landscape (present and future expected situation).

---

4 More details about Visualization in *(to ask to Intu for LLS Visualization Guidelines reference)*
Graph 5. Example of a visualization mapping exercise from a Burundi landscape

**Methodological lessons in applying visualization technique with communities**

- Be realistic and manage expectations before starting.
- Facilitation is a key factor. Be aware of potential conflict within the community and avoid generating unrealistic expectations (such as the fact that we can not help much with formal education or health sector needs). Make clear the central thematic area: forest resources, livelihoods and biodiversity.
- When working with visualization techniques (for present and future scenarios) it is better to work in two stages. First, split participants into groups according to criteria like gender, ethnicity or age. After this, seek joint agreement in a plenary session that looks for consensus.
- Understand the “good things” (i.e. strengths and opportunities in a strategic planning SWOT technique) in the landscape and within the communities that will assist us in getting to our vision.
- Understand the “not so good things” and challenges or risks (weaknesses and threats in a strategic planning SWOT technique) that could prevent us from reaching our desired vision.

Once a first round of identification of expected changes has been completed, a ranking of the most feasible outcomes are selected to develop the specific sub-theories of change. These sub-ToCs are developed with different partners, including communities.
Because you do not have the resources to develop the ToC with all communities of the landscape, you may select a sample of communities (criteria for selection varies according to drivers\(^5\)) usually between 2-6 communities and in each one develop the exercise for 1 or 2 main changes. These draft ToCs are discussed and refined with partners.

- **Tips for producing a subToC**

1. Design the sub-ToC using cards and having enough space to stick all of them in the walls to have a global view. Once developed, transform them in electronic version using Excel\(^6\) or Cmap (make clear through colors or different rectangle type of lines activities, outputs, outcomes and the “if/external factors” as in the examples).
2. For each sub-ToC start from the selected change to the up side to identify higher level outcomes (example of question to ask) and then go down from the selected change up to the last activity.
3. To ask the higher levels of change from the first change identified ask “what is the effect/outcome/consequence of this change”. Request specific changes (not “better quality of life” or similar ones) and expect, on average, up to two-three levels.
4. To ask for lower levels from the selected change ask: “What do we have to do to achieve the change regarding activities and outputs”. Expect on average about 4 levels of cards.

---

\(^5\) Drivers may be markets (access to road, presence of local fairs, etc.), ethnic groups, type/level of access to natural resources, or access to water and electricity, health and education services. The sampling of communities developed by Gill Sheperd in the Poverty toolkit is a good example.

\(^6\) You can use other software for this purpose as CMAP (http://cmap.ihmc.us/download/) that you can download for free.
Graph 6. ToC of TNS/Cameroon consolidation of increase of income and food availability and consumption outcome level aggregation of sub-ToC linked to.

When moving from one card to other, ask for the “Ifs”. Remember that it is always an iterative process and no only in one direction.

It follows an example of a Theory of change produced from a visualization exercise in Mozambique.
Graph 7: Djabula - Present Situation

Sandalwood sold by communities with no added value/under market value

Charcoal production is the main income activity using also valuable timber

Sandalwood used by communities for charcoal production due to lack of handicraft secured markets = sandalwood & other forest resources depletion

Graph 8: Djabula - Vision

Increased forest cover
Improved Sandalwood and other Forest resources stands
Improved Sandalwood sustainable production

Establishment of wood bank for Sandalwood processing (added value) and sold at market value

Improved Income from Sandalwood
Improved community infrastructure
Graph 9: Djabula landscape ToC, Mozambique

- Improved food security and natural goods
- Improved livelihoods
- Community has sufficient motive to engage actively
- If service limits are respected
- If assets are accessible
- If rights & benefits are equal and accessible
- Community have secure rights to land and resources and able to get licenses for resource use
- Land distributed & registered in community name
- If government is supportive and community willing to engage
- Participatory stakeholder meetings & awareness creation on importance of defining land; forest legislation, FTT etc
- Stakeholder discussions between Woodbank Group, charcoal producers & other WTP owners to support and/or involve in Sandwood production and protection
- If communities are willing to engage with one another and discuss ability to negotiate harvesting rights
- Voting system used to form Woodbank group in a participatory manner
- All farmers willing to participate in mg (traditional chief, village wc & dendro, women group & representatives of other canon - general pop, post-mission, chief of locality)
- Woodbank infrastructure established in line with fair & agreed criteria & necessary equipment, uniforms etc. bought
- If community use equipment well & maintain them
- If members have regulated access
- If agreements are referred to
- If PFS is willing to engage with community
- Market & mechanisms for accessing markets identified
- Exchange experiences with other similar initiatives (nationally & in the region)
- Participation in regional meetings, including FTT, Fair Trade
- Improved government of association
- If groups are willing to participate
- If membership is determined and accessible
- Agreements with Private Sector established
- Using strategy for Sandwood developed (at regional level) and negotiations with Private Sector initiated
- Association sub-groups formed (e.g. marketing, management etc)
- Community have secure rights to land and resources and able to get licenses for resource use
- If groups are willing to participate
- Management & production plan for Woodbank Association developed (definition of harvesting area, levels of harvesting allowed, training plan, recruitment etc)
- Licence (harvesting, industrial & commercial) for Woodbank acquired
- Sandwood Woodbank Association registered and sub-groups formed
- If community is to be lead or support and if it is supportive
- Agreement with General Community on harvesting Sandwood established
- If both groups are willing to work with one another and discuss ability to negotiate harvesting rights
- Community bank accounts acquired
- Community/stockists effectively endorsing management plan activities
Once all sub-ToCs have been completed, you have to integrate them in the landscape ToC. This means to show the sub-ToCs interact to achieve the major change at outcome and impact level. Here you integrate the higher level outcomes as it is showed in graphs 10 and 11 from China and Cameroon.

Finally, the integrate ToC should include at the very top the LLS global goal or an interpretation of it. This goal is “the effective implementation of national and local policies and programmes that leverage real and meaningful change in the lives of rural poor, enhance long-term and equitable conservation of biodiversity and ensure the sustainable supply of forest-related goods and services in line with nationally-defined priorities”. In this way, we are reminded that we should work not only at landscape level, but including outcomes to scale-up and/or replicate. This scale up or replication could be one sub-ToC or be at the top of any sub ToC. For instance, in the TNS/Cameroon ToC is put at the top, and in Papua Indonesia Bomberai landscape is integrated in the sub-ToC of Communal Forestry (graph 3).
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**Theory of change for Mi Yun reservoir watershed**

**Summary**

(SO 2, 6, 7, 8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FLR concepts and tools adopted in other programmes in China</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scaling up</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logging ban relaxed and allowing sustainable forest management that better serves watershed functioning and forest based incomes for local residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSD formed to negotiate trade-offs and coordinate FLR and rural development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable financing mechanisms for forest management and household incentives are identified and promoted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision support tools are available for use by MSD (GIS with landscape level datasets)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Advocacy**

- Evidence, data and communication materials required to pursue the four advocacy objectives are produced
- Participatory forest management plans approved by county government
- Timber harvest quota approved by Beijing and Hebei forestry bureau
- A transboundary and inter-sector cooperation mechanism (MSD) is established and functioning
- FLR concepts and principles embedded within forest policies and planning processes

**Influencing the Sino-German (leverage) project**

- Biodiversity surveys included in the participatory forest planning
- Stream-side reserves in forest management and silviculture treatments are recognised
- Fuelwood surveys and training for collection in areas outside project treated sub-compartments are integrated into technical standards
- Livelihood and energy initiatives to deliver more livelihood benefits are integrated into technical standards

**2 LLS (IUCN) pilot sites**

- Increase in cash incomes and energy efficiency / sources for households
- Increased areas of forest under approved, locally-negotiated, updated, multifunctional land-use plans (for water, biodiversity, forest resources)
- Community forestry arrangements for access and use of forest products for local livelihoods

**Graphic 10. LLS China integrated ToC**
The effective implementation of national and local policies and programmes that leverage real and meaningful change in the lives of rural poor, enhance long-term and equitable conservation of biodiversity and ensure the sustainable supply of forest-related goods and services in line with nationally-defined priorities.”

Livelihoods & Landscapes Strategy

Graph 11. ToC of TNS-Cameroon landscape

3.2. The development of a sub-ToC

To develop a sub-ToC the following procedure is suggested:

0. The changes have been selected through a prioritization technique (like the ranking matrix)
   - Material and equipment required: cards of 4 colors (activities, outputs, outcomes/changes, external factors), masking tape, 4 flip chart making a big square/rectangle) and markers; and a photo camera to capture the results of the work
1. The group (community members and/or LLS partners) agrees in the core change in which they will work

7 If you do not have paper of different colors, you can use white paper cards, and by having 4 marker’s colors frame them with one color according to the type representing.
Graph 12. Selection of changes to prioritize in a Burundi community (note text and drawings to allow illiterate people to understand)

2. Stick it in the center of the 4 flip charts (as a big one paper)
3. Ask the group which are the consequences of this change and write the cards and stick them in a logical sequence above it.
4. For each higher level change, try to fill an external factor (an If). In some cases, it may happen that there is none. It is fine. Do not force to put one, but be suspicious if in most of the cases they would not appear.
5. Once you complete the superior level (the change level), ask how we can achieve the expected change: the “how” or activities + outputs + external factors. You may receive different ideas of cards, start writing them in the correct color card and try to organize from down to top.
   Consider the following tips:
   • There are feedback loops among different activities or outputs. Think about inter-connections
   • Do not write the arrows until you have a final version
   • To reduce the size of the ToC and facilitate the reading of it, when the link between activity and output is too straight forward, you can avoid filling one of them. For instance instead of write “train of (20) producers” and “20 producers trained”, you may choose one of them (which one depends on the context)
6. For dissemination of the ToC follow two steps:
   a. Take photos of each ToC
   b. Prepare an electronic copy in Excel or Cmap\(^8\) or similar softwares. If you use other software, confirm that you can transfer it to a Word and/or Adobe file.

\(^8\) You can download it for free in [http://cmap.ihmc.us/download/](http://cmap.ihmc.us/download/) (English, French, Portuguese and Spanish versions among others)
4. Using the ToC during LLS implementation

In this section we will describe the methodology to use the ToC to guide your reflection for adapting management, learning and accountability. The central elements are the formulation of the M&E questions and the reflection meetings. The intention is to focus on the how, the why and so what, instead of on the what; an analytical perspective rather than a descriptive one.

In most M&E systems, the data collection processes are centered on measuring indicators that express if the outcome, output or activity has been accomplished. For our learning/analytical perspective this approach developed around the “what” is not very useful. Therefore, we are approaching our M&E with a different tool: M&E questions and their answers obtained through data collection (information needs).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. M&amp;E using M&amp;E questions versus indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topic</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome versus process M&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning versus accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory/Extractive and Quantitative/Qualitative dimensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of information required for the analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection efforts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1. Using M&E questions

The M&E questions can be referred to the process level (activities +outputs) and/or to the change level (changes/outcomes). The questions are generated through reading the ToC in order to determine the central elements of it. The idea is to ask if the hypothesis or assumptions expressed in the ToC are working or not and why yes or why not.
For example, if the outcome is that a group adopted new practices in soil conservation, we have to ask two things: 1) how many people are applying which techniques? and, 2) what are the reasons for this adoption? Then, the first question will describe the achievement (close to an indicator) and the second will recall, through perception of participants about training, promotion activities, etc; or will point out some of the activities carried on; or may be other activities not related to LLS. Then, we can contrast, during the reflection meeting that perception with information available from the process like trained register, with knowledge of partners; and with the logic expressed in the ToC in the reflection meeting.

In terms of effort, the key message here is to collect a minimum amount of information (i.e. level of achievement of the outcome and perception of participants about why). From the answers, open the discussion and incorporate all elements necessary to formulate conclusions, recommendations and lessons that will have implications in the planning of next semester and to be included in the Progress report.

This approach does not avoid the necessity to have information about activities and outputs for supervision purpose and, in a limited extent, to report to the donor (the Monitoring Protocol). But this more internal process, that we keep at the internal management of the Programme.

- **M&E questions focusing in effectiveness: clarification note**

Evaluation is field that is analyzed through five dimensions: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability.

**Table 3. Evaluation criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation criteria</th>
<th>Conceptual key question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Relevance</td>
<td>To what extent the planned changes are still valid, in particular according to the political, economic, environmental context?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Effectiveness</td>
<td>To what extent the changes have been or are likely to be achieved? What are the major factors influencing this?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Efficiency</td>
<td>Were activities cost-efficient? Were objectives achieved on time? Was the intervention implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives (or is presently implemented...)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Impact</td>
<td>What are the most significant long term changes as direct or indirect influence of the intervention? What real difference has the intervention made to the local people and the environment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sustainability</td>
<td>To what extent the benefits of the intervention would continue after donor funding ceased Which are/were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the intervention?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In our approach for the on-going M&E we concentrate data collection and processing in effectiveness only. All are important dimensions but for practical purposes, the others may appear during the reflection meetings, in particular sustainability and relevance. The 5 dimensions are considered in the external evaluation activities: the mid-term review and the final evaluation.

4.2. Methodology to formulate M&E questions

1. **Have comprehensive understanding of the sub-ToC** and its place within the ToC, in particular how its elements are articulated

2. **Identify the central elements that subordinated others in terms of change and in terms of process.** In most of the cases, the central elements are the main changes in the sub ToC. For example, if we have as a change an area reforested, our ToC may say that this will be consequence of providing plants from a nursery, training to farmers and radio broadcasters' programmes and as a consequence new economic opportunities arise (soil conservation, rights of local people reaffirmed, etc.).

3. **Formulate the direct question about the change and the reason for the change to happen or not or to what extent:** was it achieved or not and why/how? The why/how questions should be able to answer the lower levels of the ToC.

4. **Formulate the questions about the consequences of the change:** specific questions for the planned higher level changes are developed including the what (for instance have incomes increased?, have the …?) and the why to check if it is due to the LLS planned change or because of other external factors.

5. **Validate the selected questions:** read the set of developed question to check that all the expected issues to monitor and evaluate are covered.

**Graph 13. Types of M&E questions to consider**
4.3. Methodology to identify information needs

- Follow this procedure for each M&E question.
- The identification of the information needs is necessary to define the data collection because to define the technique, we have to know the kind of data to be collected (e.g. perceptions versus No of has reforested or versus agreements arrived in an assembly).

1. **Make a brainstorm list of elements that should be included to answer the M&E question.** Consider all type of answers that you want to hear. From instance, in a perception question: why have you adopted a particular practice, the information needs will include: reasons for adoption, reasons for no adoption; if partially adopted reasons for that, in which aspects has been adopted, in which not and why, number of adopters, partial-adopters and non-adopters
   As a rule of thumb avoid to just rephrasing the question in a positive statement. Even though, sometimes that it is the way that have to be done, when the information is very straight forward. Use common sense to decide.

2. **Validate the information needs**: read the set of information needs to see if there is any unnecessary repetition, information needs likely to be unfeasibly to be collected.
   Take the opportunity to revise consistency between M&E questions and information needs. Go back to the M&E questions to adjust or eliminate if not practical to collect the required needs.

Table 4. Some examples from LLS PM&E Plans to illustrate good information needs formulation (Cameroon, Ghana and Thailand):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M&amp;E question</th>
<th>Information needs</th>
<th>Methodological comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Are the local government (prefect, sub-prefecture), police, FMO, judges, and mayor implementing measures to reduce illegal hunting? | - Type of measures against poaching implemented (with reference data like number of cases) per stakeholder  
- Description of the process of generate the measures or the on going status of the generation process | Information needs link questions 1,2 and 3. Therefore, they are integrated as the data collection can be done at the same time with the same tools. |
| 2. If yes, how were these measure were developed?                            |                                                                                   |                                                                                       |
| 3. If not, any on going process to implement these measures?                  |                                                                                   |                                                                                       |
| 4. Are key Yaoundé University stakeholders informed about local poverty perceptions? | - Key stakeholders can explain the value of understanding local perceptions of poverty linked to LLS supported | The first question has identified elements for the answer. But the second information need is straight forward the same as the |
| 5. If not why                                                                 |                                                                                   |                                                                                       |
5. Data collection and processing to answer the M&E questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>activities</th>
<th>question 5.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Reasons why the activity has not been achieved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 6. Why have some HHs move up or down from one rank to the other? | - No of HHs per wealth rank  
- Key elements that make possible to move up or down (type of activities, external support, etc.) | No rephrasing, but the elements needed to answer the questions. |
| 7. Which forest rehabilitation techniques (under FLR) were more useful and less useful for farmers? And why? | List of forest rehabilitation techniques (under FLR) that have been applied by farmers  
Useful elements of the techniques  
Not useful elements of the techniques | Not rephrasing, but listing the elements of the question |

Data collected ➔ Data processed to be presented in Reflection meetings (i.e. Semi-annual meetings and Action-Learning meetings) and Reports

Once we have defined which information we need to run the PM&E, we have to select how the data – both quantitative and qualitative – will be collected to ensure we have the necessary information for reflection and reporting.

Data could be obtained from primary sources, directly from dialogue with people on the field or by observing an area, or through secondary sources; for instance published studies on a specific topic, or surveys collected from statistics offices.

The M&E data collection matrix (Annex III) will summarize when, how, and who will collect which data.

For choosing techniques to gather data, consider the following general criteria:

- **The technique allows you to answer the M&E questions:** think about which kind of data will come up: numbers, statements, are they representative of the whole group we want to infer from?
- **Be aware of your knowledge about how to apply a technique.** Techniques have rules and complexities. Participatory ones are highly demanding in facilitation expertise, interviews require preparation to formulate questions without bias, and so on. The team
should select those techniques that feel more comfortable to apply in the field. Use your intuition to assess your capacities for any specific technique. If you require support in terms of learning do not hesitate to contact IUCN officer to help you.

- **Logistics.** Some techniques require specific preparation such as measuring instruments, rooms for meetings, etc. Think about this before choosing a technique.

- **Unnecessary workload.** Whenever possible collect information/data through other activities that are already being carried out (e.g. integrating analysis into a communal meeting agenda as opposed to introducing an additional meeting). Is there really any need to “add another layer”?

- **Who’s voice?** The tools/methods selected should allow everybody to contribute and/or gather data in their own words – including those that may be illiterate, have no access to computers or that are simply uncomfortable with writing.

- **Triangulate sources or techniques.** We may, for instance, do interviews, hold meetings, and/or cross-check through field observations to verify if similar information arises about an indicator. If it does not, we should ask why not, and learn from this process. We can also reflect on the different perceptions of progress (Note that all perceptions may be valid!).

---

**Remember: there is no one golden technique. You should decide which ones suit your capacities and needs based on the above criteria**

Potential techniques available for PM&E are actually endless and permanently increasing. A good summary of the most applied ones (1 page per technique) can be found in “Methods for Monitoring and Evaluation, Annex D of Managing for Impact in Rural Development, a Guide for Project M&E”, IFAD 2000 and criteria to select methods and techniques can be found in the Section 6 “Gathering, managing and communicating information” of the same document⁹.

**The LLS most applied techniques** are (in alphabetical order):

- Direct observation
- Focus groups
- GIS Mapping
- Mapping/Visualization
- Matrix Scoring
- Photographs and video
- Semi-structural Interviews
- Social mapping/Well-Being ranking
- Stories

This is a list of the most used techniques. It is not a mandatory list. You can adapt and mix to suit your needs. You can also create your own methods.

---

⁹ Arabic, English, French and Spanish versions in [www.ifad.org/evaluation/guide/introduction.htm](http://www.ifad.org/evaluation/guide/introduction.htm)
Other techniques not much used in LLS but with potential are:

- Drama and Role Plays
- Diaries/Journals
- Most Significant Change

6. Reflecting and planning

The data collection and processing makes sense when the data transformed in information (i.e. giving a meaning) starts contributing to the learning process, which changes were achieved and how, which side-effects were provoked (“unexpected results”) and which ones were not achieved and why. LLS has two major means for this: semi-annual reflection meetings of LLS partners and communities in the landscape and a 4 month Progress Report.

The learning approach that leads the process over accountability is embedded in an Action-learning (AL) framework: a series of repeated cycles of action, observation, reflection and planning.

Graphic 14. The Action-Learning cycles in LLS


These repeated cycles can be organized through AL groups integrated by different stakeholders (like community members, partners, government bodies and of course mix groups) or through periodic meetings at minimum semi-annual basis.

**Table 5. Summary of agenda and highlight results from a SAM in TNS/Cameroon (August 9)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In TNS in Central Africa there are semi-annual meeting with partners and communities. There have been two of these SAMs in 2009 in January and August. The agenda of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} SAM was the following:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Refreshment on the TNS/Cameroon ToC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Systematization of the information prepared by implementers on advance (as inputs for the work groups)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Review by the implementer and other participants of each sub ToC to check validity of it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Review of baseline data collected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Adjustments of the subToC because changes in the context and/or the planned ToC did not work as expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Report on activities and results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Planning of activities for the next period (September-December 09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. M&amp;E plan for the next period (M&amp;E questions to be answered, Information needs, data collection techniques, responsible persons and dates)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The SAM was an opportunity to revise critically what has been done and strengthen analytical capacities of partners and community representatives. Among the key results were:

- Baselines of some subToCs were not correct: the meeting allowed to detect this and adjust or take measures to do it (through group discussion and self-quality check)
- 3 of 9 sub-ToCs were not worked as expected. The SAM provides the opportunity to adjust the ToC to an updated/improved version
- LLS reflective M&E need more support to be owned by partners. By now:
  - Partners are not using the ToC as an M&E tool because limited understanding of it as an M&E tool. They still frame their work in an activities monitoring framework. Basically an horizontal axe Activity $\rightarrow$ Product $\rightarrow$ Indicator instead of an articulated approach in which activities, outputs and external factors articulated to effective changes or results contributing to major change.
  - M&E questions still understood as a way to measure results. Questions formulating during the workshop in terms of quantities to be achieved (“indicators”) instead of questions that ask why and/or how.

Source: Furman R. Back to office Report September 2009
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected change</th>
<th>Progress</th>
<th>What we have learnt (so what)</th>
<th>Next steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Benet community started by-law process. There were laws (not owned &amp; so not implemented – e.g. on tree planting, on not planting beside river) – people did not have access to the laws, so no awareness.</td>
<td>• Coming up with a law not easy, as it touches people, need to be bottom-up – negotiations &amp; agreement. Penalties accompany law – &amp; people must understand the penalties. &amp; Cllr learning to make laws!</td>
<td>• Present to Standing Committee (again) to finalize &amp; then to council of District level &amp; needs to be prepared properly so that it is legally sound. Want process so that it actually becomes a district ordinance. Once approved by council will be binding. From council may also go to parliament. For it to become an ordinance will affect all SC’s – so how to build in local ownership, &amp; other SCs join the system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• This time brought up their own laws from the grass roots (bottom up, not top down). District has 3 steps for community laws a). Passed by comm. At LC1 level &amp; can be implemented at that level; b). It can go to parish which calls attention of sub-county – was seen as good law so it came to SC; c). Still some steps to take it to district level.</td>
<td>• Once passed at SC level it is binding – but also want to show others value of this &amp; getting other SCs want to sue the law – Tegerress also starting on this line s well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Called committee, went through draft, &amp; now more sub-counties want to support the by-law; makes links to terraces &amp; tree/grass planting</td>
<td>• Success has really hinged on local community ownership &amp; they are implementing it, but now getting district Chairman to assent – so binding at court level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Really i’d stakeholders so as to develop such by-laws, &amp; in this case develop from landscape levels. KADALAC starting to coordinate similar support (IDRC funded) in other SC (find more detail on)</td>
<td>• This law is not a forced law from parliament</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• This law is not a forced law from parliament</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Other sub-counties domesticating for own SC – changed some of the content &amp; even increased penalties (e.g. pit latrine close to river, location of coco-yams)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Barrow E. Back to Office Report September 6th-12th, 2009

- Build the reflection meeting on the present periodic meetings of LLS partner (if there is any):

In many landscapes, government institutions, NGOs and even communities have some, sort of periodic (i.e. quarterly) meetings to review their planning. These meeting tends to be focused on revising if planned activities have been implemented or not, basically a “check-list” meeting, and at the best readjust activities planning. It is missing a reflection about the usefulness/effectiveness of what have been done and their current relevance. The LLS
PM&E methodology wants to contribute to enrich these meetings by making them a reflective forum oriented to discuss, instead of activity accomplishment, how far the ToC is working and why and what have to be adjusted. We make an explicit emphasis on learning about change.

This approach in the periodic meetings is proposed for the semi-annual meetings. It is discouraged for shorter terms. Usually there is not much significant activities in a shorter period (like every 3 months). We will explain now the objective, agenda and methodology suggested for the PM&E Semi-annual Meetings (SAMs).

6.1. The major reflection moment: the SAM

All SAMs are expected to include the presence of all LLS partners (i.e. all those who are involved in implementing the activities reflected in the ToC and the work plan). Communities should have on advance SAMs at community level and tailor made according to capacities and facilitation availability. This supports learning at community level and empower the villagers by analyze and learn themselves their performance and changes happened.

A SAM will take normally about 2-4 days and includes basically 3 blocks: review of the last semester, learning from the process and planning of activities and PM&E for the next semester. There are two types of SAMs: the take-off SAM and the following ones (every 6 months). The major differences of the two types is than in the take-off SAM the first version of the Theory of change and the PM&E activities are defined. Participants are introduced in the methodology and their duties clarified. After that, they will collect the data along their implementation work, and the second SAM will come. Then, the cycle is repeated every six months.

We describe next the objective, results and methodology of the two types of SAMs: the “take-off” SAM and the following semi-annual ones.

a. First LLS Semi-annual PM&E meeting (SAM-1)

Objective:

To launch and plan the next six months PM&E, involving all partners and communities representatives (minimum PM&E for the next six months).

Results expected:

- ToC validated
- Programmatic activities in charge of each partner for the next six months identified
- M&E questions for the next six months formulated (based on the PM&E Plan for the whole LLS life cycle
- Source of answers (information needs, how?, when?, who?) identified
September 23rd 2009 Draft for comments

- Baseline and milestones agreed (if not available, the soonest date to be completed and by who)
- Consolidated PM&E Plan for next six months

**Methodology**

The meeting covers 3 sequential blocks that should be covered in 4 days (following SAMs could be developed in up to 3 days).

Due to limited experience in applying this M&E approach by all actors involved, the facilitation of the process is key. The person who will facilitate the process should have an idea of what would come out (examples, likely bottlenecks, etc.) in each block to orient the workshop. It is not a matter of logistic organization but more a matter of how people will go through to arrive to the expected results.

He/She should be sensitive to listen and clarify through examples.

He/She should understand local capacities and orient the process pragmatically under these capacities, to planning a realist and achievable discussion. This discussion should consider the 5 evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability (see table x above) to be applied in orienting the analysis.

The facilitator should be supported by a person who takes notes of all points that will be inputs for the PM&E process.

**Agenda of SAM 1 (4 days)**

1. Validation of the ToC
   - Organize the participants in groups that will validate the sub-ToCs in which they are involved.
   - Present the sub-ToCs to the plenary

Make final adjustments on the spot as the result will be needed for the next block

2. Planning of activities for the next semester (framed on the ToC)
   - Organize same groups that validated each sub-ToC to define and assign activities to each partner
   - Present the result in a big paper to be available for the next block

3. Formulate M&E questions for next semester per each sub-ToC

Same groups as for blocks 1 and 2:
   - Identify the activities and outcomes that are applicable for the semester
Formulate the M&E questions:
- What do we want to learn from the activities, outputs and outcomes to be happening?
- Select the shorter number of questions, considering the key information needs from the stakeholders
- Include descriptive (how much? What do we achieved) and analytical questions (Why? or Why not?)
- Note: it could happen that for a semester you will collect only information about the activities and outputs, because no outcome can be recorded. That is fine.

4. Data/Information collection, analysis and presentation

- List data/information to be collected (some information may be already available: for instance base line data). If correspond, identify baseline and milestone expected
- Define how the answers will be presented in the next SAM: statements, graphs, draws, videos, etc…
- Define with which techniques data/information will be collected: as guidance you may use selected techniques (from IFAD guidelines)\(^\text{11}\)

  \[\text{How? define the technique to use}\]
  \[\text{When? establish frequency or date/s during the semester}\]
  \[\text{Who? the institution present in the meeting that will be responsible}\]

- All groups will present their results to the plenary for socialization and learning

5. Set the tentative date and place for the SAM-2

6. LLS officer will consolidate the results from the SAM. The workshop result becomes the semiannual PM&E Plan.

b. Implementation of data collection and analysis (for presentation in the next SAM)

It is expected during the semester that each partner will accomplish its responsibilities. This should be supported and supervised by LLS officers.

Capacities for M&E vary among partners. Methodologies and techniques may be also different. During the SAM it is necessary to assess capacities and develop an action plan to reinforce these capacities accordingly. A common situation is a limited knowledge and practice of data collection and processing techniques. The SAM could be too short to discuss this issue. Follow-up have to be provided through LLS officers or alternative schemes (consultants, M&E global coordinator, etc.).

\(^{11}\) IFAD Annex D COMPLETAR
Example of TNS Cameroon:

During the 2\textsuperscript{nd} SAM (September 2009) it was identified through the “Next semester data collection activities planning” work groups that the LLS partners (local NGOs mostly based on the landscape) were not able to identify other than two data collection techniques: surveys and focus groups; and they were not clear about cost and time implications in terms to apply them and processing of the data. Hence, the techniques were suggested because they were the only ones known.

To answer the challenge of selecting the most feasible techniques, direct advice per NGO was decided. A local resource trained by LLS in M&E was identified and was provided with specific training in a reduced number of techniques (5 techniques) to work directly with each NGO in selecting the best technique and planning its use on the field with minimum rigor in terms of data collection and processing.

The training agenda included:
1. Review of the Theory of change M&E methodology
2. Formulation of the central M&E questions (how to select the central elements to select the questions)
3. Selection and use of data collection techniques (menu of techniques selected: observation, semi-structured interviews, focus groups, social mapping and ranking matrix), why these, criteria to select one of each question, plan to collect, process and report the data)
4. Action-learning (AL) group as an option to collect and analyze the data.

\textbf{c. Next PM&E semiannual meetings (SAM 2, SAM 3, and so on)}

From SAM-2, the meetings will start to analyze the data and information collected. Other than that, these are similar to SAM-1.

Objective:

To discuss development and changes provoked in the landscapes within or linked to LLS and partners activities in the last six months and plan the next six months PM&E involving all partners and communities representatives (minimum PM&E for the next six months).

Results expected:
- Answers to M&E questions formulated in the previous SAM
- Programmatic activities in charge of each partner for the next six months identified
- M&E questions for the next six months formulated
- Source of answers (information needs, how?, when?, who?) identified
- Consolidated PM&E Plan for the next six months
- Report synthesizing the meeting Answer to M&E questions section
Methodology

The meeting covers 3 sequential blocks to be covered in 3 days and the same guidelines for SAM 1 apply here.

Agenda of SAM 2nd, 3rd… (3 days)

0. Preparation of presentation of answers to the M&E questions

- 2 weeks before the meeting ask partners to prepare the answers to the M&E questions (not only descriptive questions but the types why and how questions should be present).
- Answers should include information that support any statement (quantitative and/or qualitative and methodology applied to collect it)

1. Per sub-TdC in plenary:

- Presentation of answers to the M&E questions (formulated in the previous SAM)
- Refresh on the ToC to be discussed
- M&E Question posed and answers (content and technique applied)
- Conclusions and recommendations

- Discussion:
  - Do the participants agree with presentation conclusions, why and/or why not explanations? (The facilitator should be prepared to do remarks regarding consistency of evidence, stress methodological lessons about quality of data, methodological process, etc.)?
  - Is there additional data/information that should be answered?
  - What should be done the next semester to reinforce the “good things” and adjust the difficulties?
  - Any unexpected result to comment?
  - Additional conclusions, recommendations and lessons regarding a) activities and outcomes, and b) M&E methodological

- It is possible that some partners do not provide the information as agreed. The facilitator should remark then, the importance for a good PM&E discussion of having proper data analysis.

2. Review of planned programme activities for the next semester for adjustment, if needed

- Proceed similar to SAM 1 (see above in Agenda of SAM 1)

3. Planning the M&E activities based on the M&E questions:

- Proceed similar to SAM 1 (see above in Agenda of SAM 1)
d. Data collection and analysis

..SAM-3...

Same as SAM-2

6.2. The Periodic Progress Report

LLS has an internal reporting process that requires every 4 months a Progress report (January-April, May-August and September-December) at country/landscape level. These reports are consistent with IUCN reporting calendar. The intention is that the analysis per report is per landscape (including its contribution to local and national levels).

The purposes of this report are:

a. To provide to IUCN country office the opportunity to systematically document the learning from implementation and reflection meetings
b. To have a standardized reporting at global level to facilitate consolidation of results and lessons to share with key stakeholders
c. To fulfill our contractual responsibilities with DGIS of proving an annual report of achievements at outcomes and activities level (the Monitoring protocol)

The outline of the report and some guidance can be found in the Internal Agreement LLS-Regional office (Annex IV). Therefore here we provide some comments to complement what has been explained in the Internal Agreement respective annex.

The Progress report is responsibility of the LLS officer. It is more than an activities descriptive report. It is an analysis framed in the landscape’s Theory of change and the PM&E Plan. It should present the outcomes of the reflection during the SAM meetings and the on-going implementation of LLS. It is a critical document that includes achievements and pitfalls, the learning of the period.

In addition, a key annex is the Monitoring Protocol that provides quantitative and qualitative information about achievements during the reported period. The consolidation of 23 countries will be delivered to the Netherlands government as a requirement under the IUCN-the Netherlands Kingdom contract.
7. Integrating the M&E elements in the PM&E Plan

The PM&E Plan systematizes and guides the learning, adaptive management and accountability process in the landscape. The Plan is developed after the workplan. In practical terms, there is an iterative process between both, the workplan and the PM&E plan. For instance, if we find that the workplan outcomes can not be tracked, the outcomes statements probably need to be reviewed to find verifiable ones. As a matter of fact, both together integrate all LLS activities (data collection, processing and reflection and reporting require time and are carried by the same actors that implement the work plan!).

This chapter presents the sections and templates that encompass the PM&E Plan. It does not discuss any technical issue. For any precision, please refer to the previous chapters. Templates can be found in Annex III.

The PM&E plan should include the following sections:

1. **Theories of change**

   This section includes two elements: a) the graphic presentation of the landscape Theory of changes; and b) a short description of it that provides some context to the cells and arrows from the graphic (about half page). The sub ToCs should be included as an annex.

2. **Methodology of the PM&E**

   Describe in half a page (maximum) the overall picture of your PM&E approach. This section is simple and straight forward. Here is a generic example:

   "The PM&E system will be developed with x, y and z as partners. By May we will have the M&E questions, information needs, and baselines and milestones for 2009 and 2010 identified with the agreement of local representatives and partners. The M&E process will be articulated through on going data collection, processing and reporting to be used, in particular, in semi-annual meetings with community representatives and LLS partners for reflection and planning next steps. These meetings will be framed on the sub Theories of change formulated and validated by May. The dynamic will be based on an Action-learning approach.

   In terms of reports, there will be presentation of results, next steps and lessons (developed with local leaders) in community assemblies and reports to local government (PLEASE BE SPECIFIC). LLS internal reporting will be in months x, y and z."

3. **M&E questions and Information Needs Matrix**

   This section is the core of the M&E system. You do not require producing any text, only the table. You organize per Strategic outcome and sub ToC the M&E questions and the Information needs and complete the baseline and milestones.
Table 7. M&E and Information Needs Matrix Template and examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome/Sub outc. No</th>
<th>M&amp;E question</th>
<th>Information needs</th>
<th>Baseline*</th>
<th>Milestone/Target 2010**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SO3.1</td>
<td>Has the community poor group in com. X and z developed new NTFP for market?</td>
<td>No of units of x NTFP developed annually per family</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Why has the community not developed the market for this product before?</td>
<td>Feedback from the communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reasons for not develop the NTFP market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Key factors to develop market for NTFP (lessons)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*can be quantitatively or qualitatively measurable but needs to be verifiable. It may be 0 or not applicable

** can be quantitatively or qualitatively measurable but needs to be verifiable

4. Data Collection Matrix

This is a table describes, for each Information need the “who”, “how” (technique) and “when” data will be collected. The first two columns are transferred from the M&E questions matrix.

Table 8. Data Collection Matrix Template and examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome/ Sub-outcome</th>
<th>Information needs</th>
<th>Data collection and processing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How/Source of verification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub outc. 1</td>
<td>No. of small livestock &amp; bee hives</td>
<td>Group mapping and Interviews to 10 HH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub outc 2.2.</td>
<td>Beijing Municipal Bureau of Forestry and Parks authority approves and implements a FLR plan for Chao He according to LLS recommendations.</td>
<td>Approved plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub outc 3.2.</td>
<td>40 has of shrub land converted to high forest</td>
<td>Inventory and photo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub outc. 3.2</td>
<td>Feedback from the communities about develop of NTFP market</td>
<td>2 Focus groups in 2 communities (men and women) producers of NTFP for market</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: you may merge sections 3 and 4 in one table if you prefer a longer table versus two smaller tables (the former has been the option decided by LLS Ghana and Uganda)
Update of the M&E Plan: after every SAM the M&E Plan may suffer adjustments from the sub-ToC to the M&E questions and so on. The LLS officer will be in charge of this update and to share the new version with the partners.
8. LLS Participatory PM&E process graphic presentation
ANNEXES
### I. Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Obligation of government, public services or funding agencies to demonstrate to citizens that contracted work has been conducted in compliance with agreed rules and standards or to report fairly and accurately on performance results vis-à-vis mandated roles and/or plans. This may require a careful, even legally defensible, demonstration that the work is consistent with the contract terms. Projects commonly focus on upward accountability to the funding agency, while downward accountability involves making accounts and plans transparent to the primary stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action-learning</td>
<td>A conscious and deliberate cyclical process of observing, reflecting, planning and acting by a group of people with shared issues or concerns (including various stakeholders) A constantly process of challenging assumptions in which each loop of the cycle represents a refinement in knowledge and a progression in action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Actions taken or work performed in a project to produce specific outputs or products by using inputs, such as funds, technical assistance and other types of resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive management</td>
<td>A process that integrates project design, management and monitoring to provide a framework for testing assumptions, adaptation and learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual result</td>
<td>See Output</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Assumption              | 1. LLS: Programme hypothesis to be tested on the field for learning purposes. In addition to the global hypothesis each Country Office may develop their own hypothesis to be tested.  
2. Logical Framework Approach: external factors (i.e. events, conditions or decisions) that could affect the progress or success of a project or programme. They are necessary to achieve the project outcomes and impacts, but are largely or completely beyond the control of the project management. They are worded as positive conditions. Initial assumptions are those conditions perceived to be essential for the success of a project or programme. Critical (or “killer”) assumptions are those conditions perceived to threaten the implementation of a project or programme. |
| Attribution             | The causal link of one thing to another; e.g. the extent to which observed (or expected to be observed) changes can be linked to a specific intervention in view of the effects of other interventions or confounding factors. |
| Baseline information    | Information – usually consisting of facts and figures collected at the initial stages of a project – that provides a basis for measuring progress in achieving project outcomes. |
| Baseline study          | An analysis describing the situation in a project area – including data on individual primary stakeholders – prior to a development intervention. Progress (results and accomplishments) can be assessed and comparisons made against it. It also serves as an important reference for the external (mid-term and final) evaluations. |
| Beneficiaries           | The individuals, groups or organisations who, in their own view and whether targeted or not, benefit directly or indirectly from the development intervention. In this Guide, they are referred to as the primary stakeholders. |
| Capacity                | The ability of individuals and organisations to perform functions effectively, efficiently and in a sustainable manner. |
| Capacity-building       | The processes through which capacity is created, a key crosscutting issue |
| Causal relationship     | A logical connection or cause-and-effect linkage existing in the achievement of related, interdependent results. Generally the term refers to plausible linkages, not statistically accurate relationships. |
| Community               | A group of people living in the same locality and sharing some common characteristics. |
| Community participation | Generally considered to be the active participation of community members in local development activities. In practice, however, the term refers to a wide range of degrees of local involvement in external development interventions, from token and passive involvement to more empowerment-oriented forms of local decision-making. |
| Cost-benefit            | The comparison of investment and operating costs with the direct benefits or impact generated by the investment in a given |

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>analysis (CBA)</td>
<td>Intervention. It uses a variety of methods and means of expressing results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost effectiveness</td>
<td>Comparison of the relative costs of achieving a given result or output by different means (employed where benefits are difficult to determine).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical reflection</td>
<td>Questioning and analysing experiences, observations, theories, beliefs and/or assumptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downward accountability</td>
<td>The process by which development organisations are accountable to their partners and poor and marginalised groups. It entails greater participation and transparency in organisations’ work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect</td>
<td>Intended or unintended change resulting directly or indirectly from a development intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>A measure of the extent to which a project attains its objectives at the goal or purpose level; i.e. the extent to which a development intervention has attained, or is expected to attain, its relevant objectives efficiently and in a sustainable way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>The extent to which the project's objectives were achieved or expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>A measure of how economically inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted into outputs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluability</td>
<td>The extent to which an activity or project can be evaluated in a reliable and credible fashion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>A systematic (and as objective as possible) examination of a planned, ongoing or completed project. It aims to answer specific management questions and to judge the overall value of an endeavour and supply lessons learned to improve future actions, planning and decision-making. Evaluations commonly seek to determine the efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability and the relevance of the project or organisation’s objectives. An evaluation should provide information that is credible and useful, offering concrete lessons learned to help partners and funding agencies make decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External evaluation</td>
<td>Evaluation carried out by independent consultants selected by the donor in agreement with IUCN. LLS has planned a mid-term and a final evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>A person who helps members of a group conduct a meeting or develop a process in an efficient and effective way but who does not dictate what will happen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>The transmission of evaluation findings to parties for whom it is relevant and useful so as to facilitate learning. This may involve the collection and dissemination of findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned from experience. Specifically in the context of evaluation, to return and share the evaluation results with those who participated in the evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four years Result</td>
<td>See Sub-outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>The socially constructed roles and opportunities associated with women and men, as well as the hidden power structures that govern relationships between women and men.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender equality</td>
<td>The different behaviours, aspirations and needs of women and men have been considered, valued and favoured equally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender equity</td>
<td>The strategies designed and put into practice to achieve the ultimate goal of gender equality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>The higher-order programme or sector objective to which a development intervention, such as a project, is intended to contribute. Thus it is a statement of intent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>The changes in the lives of rural people, as perceived by them and their partners at the time of evaluation, plus sustainability-enhancing change in their environment to which the project has contributed. Changes can be positive or negative, intended or unintended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent evaluation</td>
<td>See “External evaluation”. An evaluation carried out by entities and persons free of control by those responsible for the design and implementation of the development intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Quantitative or qualitative factor or variable that provides a simple and reliable basis for assessing achievement, change or performance. A unit of information measured over time that can help show changes in a specific condition. A given result or outcome can have multiple indicators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effects</td>
<td>The unplanned changes brought about as a result of the intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input</td>
<td>The financial, human and material resources necessary to produce the intended outputs of a project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>A landscape is a geographical space in which biophysical components, including people, and the multiple dimensions of human society (social, political, psychological and institutional) interact in an integrated, but not necessarily sustainable, manner.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**For LLS in particular, a landscape is a geographic space where negotiations are held between the various local and external stakeholders to achieve a balance between the ecological, social and economic benefits provide by forests and trees within a broader pattern of land use.**

| **Learning** | Reflecting on experience to identify how a situation or future actions could be improved and then using this knowledge to make actual improvements. This can be individual or group-based. Learning involves applying lessons learned to future actions, which provides the basis for another cycle of learning. |
| **Lessons learned** | Knowledge generated by reflecting on experience that has the potential to improve future actions. A lesson learned summarises knowledge at a point in time, while learning is an ongoing process. |
| **Logical framework approach (LFA)** | An analytical, presentational and management tool that involves problem analysis, stakeholder analysis, developing a hierarchy of objectives and selecting a preferred implementation strategy. It helps to identify strategic elements (inputs, outputs, purpose/outcomes, goal/impact) and their causal relationships, as well as the external assumptions (risks) that may influence success and failure. It thus facilitates planning, execution and evaluation of a project. |
| **Logical framework matrix** | Also known as “logframe” or “logframe matrix”. A table, usually consisting of four rows and four columns, that summarises what the project intends to do and how (outcomes, activities and outputs), what the key assumptions are, and how outputs and outcomes will be monitored and evaluated. The LLS simplified and flexible matrix is only two rows (Outcomes and activities). Outputs (3rd row from down) are acting as indicators of activities and goal/impact is only include as an umbrella statement (non measurable). |
| **Local outcome** | See Sub-outcome |
| **Means of verification** | The expected source(s) of information that can help answer the performance question or indicators. This is found in the third column of the standard logframe. It is detailed further in the M&E Matrix |
| **Mid-term evaluation** | An external evaluation performed towards the middle of the period of implementation of the project, whose principal goal is to draw conclusions for reorienting the project strategy. |
| **Milestone** | A specified statement that indicates the expected achievement at activity, annual result or 4years result or outcome level in a precise manner. It could be quantitative or quantitatively expressed |
| **Monitoring** | The regular collection and analysis of information to assist timely decision making, ensure accountability and provide the basis for evaluation and learning. It is a continuing function that uses methodical collection of data to provide management and the main stakeholders of an ongoing project or programme with early indications of progress and achievement of objectives. |
| **Monitoring and evaluation (M&E)** | The combination of monitoring and evaluation which together provide the knowledge required for: a) adaptive project management, b) reporting and accountability responsibilities, c) learning and d) empower the primary stakeholders. |
| **M&E system** | The set of planning, information gathering and synthesis, and reflection and reporting processes, along with the necessary supporting conditions and capacities required for the M&E outputs to make a valuable contribution to project decision-making and learning. |
| **Objective hierarchy** | The different levels of objectives, from activities up to goal, as specified in the first column of the logframe. If the project is designed well, realisation of each level in the hierarchy should lead to fulfilment of the project goal. |
| **Outcome** | Changes in the behaviour, relationships, skills, awareness, knowledge and attitudes of the local population, its organizations and rules or of the LLS partners that can be logically linked to a program (although they are not necessarily directly caused by it). |
| **Outputs** | The tangible (easily measurable, practical), intended product through sound management of the agreed inputs. Examples of outputs include goods, services or infrastructure produced by a project and meant to help realise its purpose. These may also include intended changes, resulting from the intervention, that are needed to achieve the outcomes at the purpose level. |
| **Participation** | One or more processes in which an individual (or group) takes part in specific decision-making and action, and over which s/he may exercise specific controls. It is often used to refer specifically to processes in which primary stakeholders take an active part in planning and decision-making, implementation, learning and evaluation. This often has the intention of sharing control over the resources generated and responsibility for their future use. |
| **Participatory M&E** | A broad term for the involvement of primary and other stakeholders in evaluation. The primary focus may be the information needs of stakeholders rather than the donor. |
| **Partner** | The individuals and/or organizations that collaborate to achieve mutually agreed upon objectives, in this case in a project. |
| **The concept of partnership** | con-notes shared goals, common responsibility for outcomes, distinct accountabilities and reciprocal obligations. Partners may include governments, civil society, non-govern-mental organizations, universities, professional and business associations, multi-lateral organizations, private companies, etc. |
| **Performance** | The degree to which a development intervention or a development partner operates according to specific criteria/standards/guidelines or achieves results in accordance with stated goals or plans. |
| **Performance question** | A question that helps guide the information seeking and analysis process, to help understand whether the project is performing as planned or, if not, why not. |
| **Primary stakeholders** | The main intended beneficiaries of a project. |
| **Programme** | A group of related projects and activities with a specified set of resources (human, capital, and financial) directed to the achievement of a set of common goals within a specified period of time. |
| **Project** | An intervention that consists of a set of planned, interrelated activities designed to achieve defined objectives within a given budget and a specified period of time. |
| **Project impacts** | The changes in a situation that arise from the combined effects of project activities, or the extent to which the goal or highest-level project objectives are achieved. Impact also refers to any unintended positive or negative changes that result from a project. Impact sometimes means anything achieved by the project beyond direct outputs. |
| **Qualitative** | Something that is not summarised in numerical form, such as minutes from community meetings and general notes from observations. Qualitative data normally describe people's knowledge, attitudes or behaviours. |
| **Quantitative** | Something measured or measurable by, or concerned with, quantity and expressed in numbers or quantities. |
| **Relevance** | The extent to which the objectives of a project are consistent with the target group's priorities and the recipient and donors' policies. |
| **Reliability** | Consistency or dependability of data and evaluation judgements, with reference to the quality of the instruments, procedures and analyses used to collect and interpret evaluation data. Information is reliable when repeated observations using the same instrument under identical conditions produce similar results. |
| **Resources** | Items that a project has or needs in order to operate, such as staff time, managerial time, local knowledge, money, equipment, trained personnel and socio-political opportunities. |
| **Result** | In LLS: major activities products stated in the work plan. Also named outputs General: a. Output b. the logical sequence from outputs to impacts |
| **Risk** | Possible negative external factors, i.e. events, conditions or decisions, which are expected to seriously delay or prevent the achievement of the project objectives and outputs (and which are normally largely or completely beyond the control of the project management). |
| **Sample** | The selection of a representative part of a population in order to determine parameters or characteristics of the whole population. |
| **Self- evaluation** | An evaluation by those who are administering or participating in a programme or project in the field and/or by those who are entrusted with the design and delivery of (part of) a development intervention. As with any evaluation, a self-evaluation focuses on overall impact and performance, or specific aspects thereof. |
| **Situation analysis** | The process of understanding the status, condition, trends and key issues affecting people, ecosystems and institutions in a given geographic context at any level (local, national, regional, international). |
| **Source of verification** | See means of verification |
| **Stakeholders** | A person or institution that can influence or is influenced by and/or involved in the programme, or receives or uses products/services that the landscape programme is providing |
| **Stakeholder participation** | Active involvement by stakeholders in the design, management and monitoring of the project. Full participation means all representatives of key stakeholder groups at the project site become involved in mutually agreed, appropriate ways. |
| **Strategic Outcome** | In LLS it refers to global outcomes committed in the Programme document. Please see outcome definition. |
| **Sub-outcome** | An outcome defined at landscape, country or geographic component level. It is linked to a Strategic outcome |
| **Sustainability** | The likelihood that the positive effects of a project (such as assets, skills, facilities or improved services) will persist for an
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target group</strong></th>
<th>The specific group, for whose benefit the project or programme is undertaken, closely related to impact and relevance.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Triangulation</strong></td>
<td>Use of a variety of sources, methods or field team members to cross check and validate data and information to limit biases. By combining multiple data sources, methods, analyses or theories, researchers and evaluators seek to overcome the bias that comes from single informants, single methods, single observer or single theory studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Validity</strong></td>
<td>The extent to which something is reliable and actually measures up to or makes a correct claim. This includes data collection strategies and instruments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Validation</strong></td>
<td>The process of cross-checking to ensure that the data obtained from one monitoring method are confirmed by the data obtained from a different method.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vertical logic</strong></td>
<td>A summary of the project that spells out the causal relationships between, on the one hand, each level of the objective hierarchy (inputs/activities-outputs, outputs/outcomes, outcomes-goal) and, on the other, the critical assumptions and uncertainties that affect these linkages and lie outside the project manager's control.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vision</strong></td>
<td>A description of the large-scale development changes (economic, political, social, or environmental) to which the program hopes to contribute. It is developed in a participatory way with active involvement of the communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work plan</strong></td>
<td>A detailed document stating which activities are going to be carried out in a given time period, and how the activities relate to the common objectives and vision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. Examples of community based data collection and processing and reporting

Congo Basin

A scoring sheet was developed from a best case situation to a worst case one (5 to 1). In each case, the community would agree on what constituted an appropriate measure for each box. It is periodically discussed by community members to provide an assessment of change, or strength of trend (same exercise could be done in parallel with other stakeholders and cross check results).

Table 2: Community Based Measuring of Chosen Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural Resource Indicators</th>
<th>5 (best)</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1 (worst)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Availability of NTFPs</td>
<td>Very easily available</td>
<td>Sufficiently available</td>
<td>Available</td>
<td>Somewhat limited</td>
<td>Very limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of wildlife</td>
<td>Very abundant</td>
<td>Sufficiently available</td>
<td>Available</td>
<td>somewhat limited</td>
<td>very rare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incidence of fires</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Some - isolated</td>
<td>Several</td>
<td>Fires are important</td>
<td>Big fires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process of certification</td>
<td>At least 70% of the concessions certified</td>
<td>50-70% certified</td>
<td>Most important concessions certified</td>
<td>Starting the process of certification</td>
<td>No progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidence of Pollution</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Pollution minor and localized</td>
<td>Average amount of pollution</td>
<td>Pollution a problem</td>
<td>Pollution everywhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition of water courses</td>
<td>no problem</td>
<td>Some siltation of large water courses</td>
<td>Localized disruption of water courses</td>
<td>Localized disruption of secondary water courses</td>
<td>General disruption of all water courses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This provided a basis for comparing changes in the situation over time, as the tables below show for sites in the Congo Basin, where changes can be detected in, for example, the availability of potable water. There was no change between 2006 and 2008 in Cameroon (score remained at 3), while in TNS there was a positive improvement in potable water from a score of about 3.5 in 2006 to a score of 4.5 in 2008.

Table 3. Availability of Potable Water
Using such an approach it is possible to look at the change within a quantitative information as being more important than an understanding of the absolute empirical changes that may be happening.

If communities have such means to measure their own indicators, (they have developed what they will measure for the different criteria from best to worst), this then forms the basis for assessing trends (e.g. moving from 1 or worst-case situation, to 5 which is a significant improvement). This can form a strong basis for providing a detailed account to strengths and trends of change. Such data can also be complemented by more empirical data collection (for instance through use of Masters Students or other research).
## III. LLS PM&E Plan Templates

### Template 1: Indicator and Information Needs Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome/Sub outcome N°</th>
<th>M&amp;E question</th>
<th>Information needs</th>
<th>Baseline*</th>
<th>Milesontone xxxx (year)**</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>
</tbody>
</table>

*can be quantitatively or qualitatively measurable but needs to be verifiable. It may be 0 or not applicable  
** can be quantitatively or qualitatively measurable but needs to be verifiable

### Template 2: Data Collection Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome/Sub-outcome</th>
<th>Information needs</th>
<th>Data collection and processing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How/Source of verification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>When: Freq or month/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Who</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Alternative Template 1+2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome/Sub outcome N°</th>
<th>M&amp;E question</th>
<th>Information needs</th>
<th>Data collection and processing</th>
<th>Baseline*</th>
<th>Milesontone xxxx (year)**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How and when?</td>
<td>Who?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*can be quantitatively or qualitatively measurable but needs to be verifiable. It may be 0 or not applicable  
** can be quantitatively or qualitatively measurable but needs to be verifiable
IV. Example of Progress report

(A country report from May-August 2009 will be included here – It may be slightly modified if need refinement)
V. Resources list

This annex presents resources available at three levels: (a) PM&E guidelines, (b) bibliographies and portals, and (c) methodologies and techniques. It does not pretend to be an exhaustive list. Rather, it is a selection of those resources that may be most useful for LLS staff and partners.

**Guidelines**


**Bibliographies and Portals**

This subsection shows only the links most applicable to LLS PM&E. There are many more Web pages (including International and Regional Evaluation Associations) that are not listed here.

- Landscape measures Resources Center, Cornell University & Eco-agriculture Partners [www.landscapemeasures.org/](http://www.landscapemeasures.org/)
- Monitoring and Evaluation news [www.mande.co.uk](http://www.mande.co.uk)
- Evaluation portal in Spanish PREVAL [www.preval.org](http://www.preval.org) (some information in English)
Methodologies and Techniques

Action-Learning – Action-Research

Case studies
- Case studies in David’s Web home: http://cq-pan.cqu.edu.au/david-jones/Reading/Misc_Research_Approaches/Yin/

Most Significant Change Technique
- www.mande.co.uk/docs/MSCGuide.pdf

Outcome mapping

Participatory Video
- Participatory Video in a Nutshell http://insightshare.org/PV_nutshell.html

Rich Picture
- Rich picture http://systems.open.ac.uk/materials/t552/pages/rich/richAppendix.html
- Rich pictures http://portals.wi.wur.nl/ppme/?page=1132

Stories http://portals.wi.wur.nl/files/docs/ppme/LISTENING_TO_THE_PEOPLE_IN_POVERTY_A_Manual_In_Life_History_Collection.doc
September 23rd 2009

Theory of change

- Clark Helene & Anderson Andrew 2004 Theories of change and logic models: telling them apart. Presented at the American Evaluation Association Conference, Atlanta, Georgia
- Gajewski M. Blog Never the same river twice, how to create a theory of change [www.blog.neverthesamerivertwice.com/2008/05/07/how-to-create-a-theory-of-change/](http://www.blog.neverthesamerivertwice.com/2008/05/07/how-to-create-a-theory-of-change/)
- Walters Hettie 2007 Capacity Development, Institutional Change and Theory of change: What do we mean and where are the linkages, a conceptual background paper. Wageningen?
- Wageningen International Theories of Change [http://portals.wi.wur.nl/successfailuredevelopment/?page=4194](http://portals.wi.wur.nl/successfailuredevelopment/?page=4194)