

Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation in the International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development (ICIMOD)

A report of an evaluation to the Royal Norwegian Embassy,
Kathmandu, Nepal, and Norad

by

Stein Bie and Marte Qvenild

Noragric Report No. 29
October 2005

Noragric
Norwegian University of Life Sciences

Noragric is the Department of International Environment and Development Studies at the Norwegian University of Life Sciences (UMB). Noragric's activities include research, education and assignments, focusing particularly, but not exclusively, on developing countries and countries with economies in transition. Besides Noragric's role as the international gateway for UMB, Noragric also acts on behalf of the Norwegian College of Veterinary Medicine (NVH) and of Norwegian Agricultural Research International (NARI), which form alliances with UMB.

Noragric Reports present findings from various studies and assignments, including programme appraisals and evaluations.

This Noragric Report was commissioned by the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD) to Noragric. Extracts from this publication may only be reproduced after prior consultation with the consultant team leader (Stein Bie).

The findings, interpretations and conclusions expressed in this publication are entirely those of the author(s) and cannot be attributed directly to the Department of International Environment and Development Studies (Noragric/UMB).



Bie, S. and Qvenild, M. Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation in the International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development (ICIMOD). Noragric Report No. 29, October 2005.

Dept. of International Environment and Development Studies, Noragric

Norwegian University of Life Sciences (UMB)

P.O. Box 5003

N-1432 Aas

Norway

Tel.: +47 64 96 52 00

Fax: +47 64 96 52 01

Internet: <http://www.umb.no/noragric>

ISSN: 1502-8127

Photo credits: J.B. Aune, I. Bryceson, P. Wisborg

Cover design: Spekter Reklamebyrå as, Ås

Printed at: Rotator, Ås

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Abbreviations/Acronyms	iv
1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
2. CONTEXT OF THIS REVIEW	3
3. QQR AND BoG CONCERNS ON M&E	4
4. PLANNING, MONITORING AND EVALUATION (PM&E)	4
4.1 Planning	4
4.2 Monitoring and Evaluation	7
4.3 Some methodological challenges	9
5. CONCLUSIONS	12
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	13
REFERENCES	14
Appendix 1. Terms of Reference	15
Appendix 2. Review of literature on Monitoring and Evaluation	18
Appendix 3. Itinerary	25
Appendix 4. Persons interviewed	26

ABBREVIATIONS/ACRONYMS

ARID	Agricultural and Rural Income Diversification (of ICIMOD)
BoG	Board of Governors (of ICIMOD)
CEGG	Culture, Equity, Gender and Governance (of ICIMOD)
CGIAR	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
CIAT	International Centre for Tropical Agriculture
DANIDA	Danish International Development Agency
DFID	Department for International Development (UK)
GTZ	(Deutsche) Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (German Technical Cooperation)
HKH	Hindu Kush-Himalayas
ICIMOD	International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development
ICLARM	International Center for Living Aquatic Resources Management
IDRC	International Development Research Centre (Canada)
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IFPRI	International Food Policy Research Institute
IKM	Information and Knowledge Management (of ICIMOD)
IPs	Integrated Programmes (of ICIMOD)
ISG	International Support Group (of ICIMOD)
ISNAR	International Service for National Agricultural Research
LFA	Logical Framework Analysis (or Approach)
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MENRIS	Mountain Environment and Natural Resources Information Systems (of ICIMOD)
MIS	Management Information Systems
MTAP	Medium Term Action Plan (of ICIMOD)
NARS	Natural Resources Systems Programme
NORAD	Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation
NORAGRIC	Dept. of International Environment and Development Studies, The Norwegian University of Life Sciences
NRM	Natural Resource Management (of ICIMOD)
NRSP	Natural Resources Systems Programme (UK)
PAC	Program Advisory Committee (of the BoG)
PARDYP	People and Resource Dynamics in Mountain Watershed of the HKH Project (of ICIMOD)
PM&E	Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation/ Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation
PPD	Policy and Partnership Development (of ICIMOD)
QQR	Quinquennial Review
RMC	Regional Member Countries (of ICIMOD)
SDC	Swiss Development Cooperation
SIDA	Swedish International Development Agency
ToR	Terms of Reference
WHEM	Water, Hazard and Environmental Management (of ICIMOD)

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

At the request of the Royal Norwegian Embassy in Kathmandu, Nepal, and of Norad, Oslo, Norway, a two-person team from Noragric, the Norwegian University of Life Sciences, Ås, Norway, has reviewed the status of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation procedures in use at ICIMOD, Kathmandu, and partners during a 9 day visit in October 2005. Based on material available, including a recent PM&E review by a German GTZ team on ICIMOD progress, and extensive interviews with ICIMOD staff, partners and donors, the Noragric team concludes that significant progress has been made since the ICIMOD Board of Governors meeting in December 2004. ICIMOD is on a good track to obtaining a meaningful PM&E system.

The Noragric team has made 17 recommendations to further strengthen the development toward a comprehensive ICIMOD PM&E system. Some recommendations are aimed at ICIMOD's Board and Management, some at ICIMOD's donor community. They are summarized below.

Recommendation 1. We recommend donors to accept the Logical Framework Analysis procedures implemented in ICIMOD, as they are based on international standard procedures, and not to insist that ICIMOD uses the application of LFA procedures specific to the donor country or international organization.

Recommendation 2. We recommend that ICIMOD also considers instituting Logical Framework Analysis procedures for the overall planning of ICIMOD's work; not only at project and programme level, and that future medium term action plans and strategies are better expressed in a suitable LFA framework.

Recommendation 3. Whilst alternative planning approaches to LFA exist, we recommend that the Board, the ICIMOD partners and the donors accept the ICIMOD LFA approach now in use.

Recommendation 4. We suggest that ICIMOD Board and Management seriously consider the introduction of an integrated Management Information System. This will be very helpful for planning, monitoring and evaluation. We recommend that contact be established with similar organizations to gain from their experience in MIS implementation.

Recommendation 5. Coupled to any decision to implement an MIS should be an adequate budget allocation for this purpose.

Recommendation 6. If – for the time being – an integrated MIS is not implemented, we nevertheless recommend that that the on-going implementation of a monitoring and evaluation system is actively continued.

Recommendation 7. We recommend that ICIMOD in its project proposals to donors continues to stress the value of preceding baseline studies and similar,

when appropriate, as monitoring and evaluation without a reference starting point involve much uncertainty.

Recommendation 8. We recommend to donors that they – contrary to common practice – allocate project funding for baseline and similar studies.

Recommendation 9. We recommend that ICIMOD staff familiarize themselves with current thinking on Monitoring and Evaluation, possibly through seminars and workshops, paying particular attention to current trends to give equal emphasis to data pertaining to quality and processes as to traditionally quantitative data and indicators.

Recommendation 10. As with LFA, we plead with donors and other interested parties not to impose “*their* M&E method” as a condition for funding but to consider the emerging ICIMOD PM&E system on its own merit as tailored to the specific basket of programmes and projects ICIMOD and partners conduct in the region.

Recommendation 11. We recommend that the ICIMOD M&E Officer leads the development of a suitable M&E tool kit and associated training for project leaders and programme managers to enable them to conduct their own M&E at project and programme level.

Recommendation 12. We recommend that the overall M&E of ICIMOD’s institution work is assigned to the M&E Officer.

Recommendation 13. We encourage the M&E Officer to continue evaluating participatory M&E methods for an ICIMOD “tool kit”.

Recommendation 14. We recommend that ICIMOD considers developing a computer-assisted decision-support system based M&E system, possibly with links to its GIS facility, and considers that it be web-based to encourage its use among national partners. Initially, or alternatively, a book-based “handyguide” combined with a “help desk” function could serve this role.

Recommendation 15. Unlike the GTZ team we do not think that an organizational change in the position of the M&E Officer is central to the introduction of a functional M&E system.

Recommendation 16. To ensure that M&E activities are considered central to ICIMOD’s work we strongly recommend that a non-fungible budget allocation of approx. 5% is earmarked in project proposals and budgets, and 2-3% in programme budgets for M&E activities.

Recommendation 17. We recommend that the GTZ-proposed 3 year timetable for M&E implementation is revisited, with the aim of shortening the within-ICIMOD time required to 1.5 – 2 years, whilst 3 years or more be considered more relevant for partner institutions.

2. THE CONTEXT FOR THIS REVIEW

ICIMOD is an international, regional research and development organization working in and for the fragile mountain region of the Hindu Kush – Himalaya (HKH) region. Since it was established in 1983, ICIMOD has promoted economically and environmentally sound development for the inhabitants and ecosystems of Greater Himalaya. ICIMOD has eight regional members and founder countries (RMCs) – Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, China, India, Myanmar, Nepal, and Pakistan. It provides a non-political platform for regional cooperation between actors from different levels, e.g. central and local governments, national and international non-governmental organizations, academic institutions, farmers organizations, and their policymakers, scientists and development agents. The organization has developed six integrated programmes to address the complex socio-economic and environmental conditions that make the many of the people of the HKH region poor and vulnerable. The six integrated programmes are: The Natural Resource Management Programme; the Agricultural and Rural Income Diversification Programme; the Water, Hazards and Environmental Management Programme; the Culture, Equity, Gender and Governance Programme; the Policy and Partnership Development Programme and the Programme on Information and Knowledge Management. ICIMOD has its headquarters in Kathmandu, Nepal.

Norway has for some years been contributing project, and lately unrestricted core, funding to ICIMOD, currently at approx. USD 500,000/year, of a total ICIMOD annual budget of approx. USD 5.7 million (2004). The current 2003-2007 funding agreement between Norad and ICIMOD stipulates that Norad may conduct reviews of ICIMOD activities during the funding period. This is of importance to the Norwegian donor as neither the Medium Term Action Planning period (MTAP) nor the 5-yearly (Quinquennial) reviews (QQR) (the documents on which Norway would otherwise base its assessments) necessarily correspond to the Norwegian funding period. In order to assure due diligence in the disbursement of its funds, Norad requires assessment of the use of its contribution at the mid-way stage of the funding period.¹

ICIMOD's activities in the fields of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (PM&E) have been the subject of comment and some concern, with associated advice, in previous QQRs and Board of Governors (BoG) meetings. The Norwegian donor has decided, with the agreement of ICIMOD's Director General, to make PM&E the topic of its mid-term evaluation. This report reflects on the mutually agreed Terms of Reference (ToR) (Appendix 1). By attempting to see the challenge to ICIMOD on PM&E in the context of the wider debate on internationally accepted PM&E methodologies, and a developing international consensus on the pro's and con's of alternative approaches, this report also strives to give further encouragement to PM&E efforts now underway in ICIMOD and with its partners.

¹ This Team assumes that the two parties were unable to take due cognizance of the GTZ report of 25 August 2005 (released approx. 10 September 2005) on Strengthening ICIMOD Monitoring and Evaluation (Reichert and Gellert 2005). There is significant overlap between their implicit ToR and those of our Team. It is assumed that this GTZ report arrived too late to have been considered. However, it has been very valuable to this Norwegian Team.

3. QQR AND BoG CONCERNS ON PM&E

In the ICIMOD QQRs of 1995 and 2001 the external evaluators expressed concern about perceived weaknesses in the monitoring and evaluation of ICIMOD's activities, both those conducted within ICIMOD, and with ICIMOD partners (for a review of these concerns, see QQR 2001, Annex 9; and Reichert and Gellert 2005, section 4). Responding to the QQR 2001 findings, the BoG of ICIMOD asked ICIMOD Management to make major efforts to improve the situation. At BoG Dec 2003 this was clearly stated, on the basis of a report from the BoG Program Advisory Committee (PAC). Reports from Management were given at the 11th PAC meeting in December 2004, associated with the 34th BoT meeting held at that time². In Dec. 2004 the BoG concluded that a "good start" had been made with a first report from the new M&E officer to PAC of Dec 2004 (Ahmad, draft Dec 2004). At the 11th PAC meeting (Dec. 2004) The M&E Officer had tabled a note outlining ICIMOD's response to QQR and BoG concerns on M&E (Ahmad 2004). The note acknowledged that less than expected progress had been made in the intervening Board meeting period, that there had been a change in M&E staff and responsibilities, but that new modalities were being introduced. It provided some early examples of new monitoring formats, e.g. outcome mapping. Whilst PAC and BoG noted that they had had insufficient time to review the note, they also encouraged further developments along the lines suggested. Notes from the Norwegian Embassy representative to the ICIMOD International Support Group (ISG) meetings in December 2004 illustrate that monitoring and evaluation, including impact studies, remained a concern for several donors (Sitaula, 2005).

In Dec 2004 members of the ISG offered informally further assistance to ICIMOD in order to strengthen its M&E activities. German GTZ provided in August 2005 a two-person team to review and suggest ways forward (Reichert and Gellert, 2005). The GTZ Team concluded that strengthening has started, that significant work remains, but that very positive steps have been taken across a broad front of issues (idem, 2005, section 4.8). The GTZ team made specific proposals for PM&E work along a 3 year milestone plan (idem, section 5). (See also Footnote 1.)

4. PLANNING, MONITORING AND EVALUATION (PM&E)³

4.1 PLANNING

The principles of effective PM&E rely on Monitoring and Evaluation being preceded by an effective Planning procedure. M&E of projects or programmes that have been developed on an *ad hoc* or unsystematic way becomes immensely more complicated and unreliable than building M&E on more stringent or formalized planning

² As the minutes of the two latter meetings have not yet been approved, reference is given to the Draft PAC and BoG meetings 8-9 December 2004, kindly made available to the Evaluation Team. PAC draft minutes pages 1, 8-9; and BoG draft minutes p. 9 refer.

³ The **P** in PME has been used to designate different terms. Also within ICIMOD the **P** is sometimes used to designate *Participatory* M&E (e.g. Vernooy et al., 2006 – in print). Unless we state otherwise, this Team uses the **P** in the traditional sense of *Planning*, M&E. There is a distinct difference between the two uses, and maybe a little unfortunate that there is this ambiguity both within ICIMOD and in the international literature on the PME term

procedures. It is self-evident that to monitor and evaluate the outcomes or outputs of a diffusely defined project or programme, where what to monitor and evaluate remains poorly defined, will inevitably lead to more subjectivity and confusion among monitors and evaluators, lowering the reliability of the M&E conclusions.⁴

This has been the main concern of ICIMOD's BoG for many years, and has been reflected in consecutive QQRs and PAC/BoG minutes. ICIMOD Management has responded by introducing Logical Framework Analysis (or Approach) (LFA) as its basic planning procedure.⁵ This Team has reviewed, and by sampling ascertained, LFA procedures in use in ICIMOD for programmes and projects. There is clear evidence that LFA has become a standard planning tool for ICIMOD's programmes and projects. Our observations indicate that LFA has been used as a primary planning tool for new programmes and projects initiated during the last 2 years. We have further had reported that all relevant ICIMOD staff, and the staff of key partner institutions at international and national level, have undergone ICIMOD-initiated training in LFA. Our limited sample of national partners in India, Pakistan and Nepal has confirmed this general statement, although there may still be individuals yet to undergo LFA training. We note, however, that the actual choice of LFA methods have to some extent been influenced by the actual or perceived requirements of the programme or project donors, thus several LFA methods have been employed. It would have been advantageous if donors could universally agree to accept a common ICIMOD LFA format instead of insisting on their own variant.

Recommendation 1. We recommend donors to accept the Logical Framework Analysis procedures implemented in ICIMOD, as they are based on international standard procedures, and not to insist that ICIMOD uses the application of LFA procedures specific to the donor country or international organization.

This Team has, however, noted that LFA techniques are not in use at central level in ICIMOD. Whilst programmes and projects (under various names) have been subject to LFA, ICIMOD's overall, central agenda has not. In lieu of this ICIMOD refers to its strategic plans, e.g. "Partnerships in Sustainable Mountain Development, 2003-2007" (ICIMOD, 2003a). The Team concurs with ICIMOD Management that LFA may not be an optimal tool for defining and guiding the overall activities of ICIMOD as an institute, but wishes to point out that monitoring and evaluation of ICIMOD's achievements then become less stringent than if a suitable LFA-like framework had been used also at this level. The BoG-acclaimed "1983-2004 An Internal Assessment of ICIMOD's Achievements, Challenges and Lessons Learnt" (ICIMOD, 2004) therefore has a somewhat looser and qualitative narrative than if based on a LFA framework. Whilst this is understandable, as LFA was not a common framework in the 1980's, nor in the first half of the 1990's, it is worth revisiting in 2005/2006 the

⁴ That is not to say that good or extraordinary science cannot come from a project that was poorly defined at its onset. Any reader of Charles Darwin's "The Voyage of The Beagle" will surely perceive that the Theory of Evolution arose from less than well-planned observations.

⁵ There are many descriptions of LFA, and many variations. Norad (1990, revised 1996,1999) may serve as an illustration of a large set of LFA manuals and descriptions. Most international donors, aid agencies and scientific institutions now insist on the presentation of project proposals to include LFA, and most science-based institutions comply. This Team does not find it useful to favour one LFA method over another, as long as it is well-defined. It appears to this Team that ICIMOD has been particularly inspired by German (GTZ) and Canadian (IDRC) approaches to LFA.

decision not to subject ICIMOD centrally to an LFA framework. Indeed, we find that the “ICIMOD Medium Term Action Plan 2003-2007” (ICIMOD, 2003b) (MTAP) could meaningfully have assembled the LFA frameworks of its six Integrated Programmes (IPs) into an LFA-like framework for the Action Plan. This Team appreciates that during the last 2-3 years repeated attempts have been made to incorporate LFA thinking also at institutional level, and we do not underestimate the difficulties in achieving this at higher levels of abstraction. This Team nevertheless suggests to ICIMOD Management that it considers an LFA approach for future action plans in order to create more visibility for the continuity in the overall ICIMOD planning process. We note that LFA should be aimed at project and programme planning rather than for organizational planning.

Recommendation 2. We recommend that ICIMOD also considers instituting Logical Framework Analysis procedures for the overall planning of ICIMOD’s work, not only at project and programme level, and that future medium term action plans and strategies are better expressed in a suitable LFA framework.

An understanding of ICIMOD’s (Planning process) is essential for a further understanding and evaluation of its M&E efforts. The Team applauds ICIMOD’s disciplined introduction of LFA as a planning tool for programmes and projects. The Team acknowledges that ICIMOD’s sound training programmes for LFA users has led to general acceptance of LFA, and – more importantly – a general realization of the value of LFA for good programme and project execution and for achieving scientific and development goals. It could be argued – and some have done so - that other formal planning procedures, different from LFA, could have achieved similar results, but this Team does not find that an issue. ICIMOD has chosen an LFA approach, done it well, and that should be considered adequate by the BoG, ISG and donors and partners.

Recommendation 3. Whilst alternative planning approaches to LFA exist, we recommend that the Board, the ICIMOD partners and the donors accept the ICIMOD LFA approach now in use.

However, we note that LFA in ICIMOD is poorly embedded in the management information systems (MIS) that are in place in ICIMOD. Indeed, we find little evidence that the various project and programme files are thus integrated that they automatically or easily feed into a central MIS. ICIMOD Management acknowledges that – although desirable - ICIMOD does not have an integrated MIS at present, and this Team has been unable to find evidence that the introduction of an integrated MIS is planned in the near future. It is generally accepted that the inclusion of PM&E methods in an organization is greatly facilitated by an efficiently operated MIS system (Vernon, 2001). It must also be appreciated that in a knowledge-based institution like ICIMOD an MIS-system must go much beyond supporting only M&E activities. An MIS system is frequently the backbone of a wide knowledge system. However, in reality very few agricultural research organizations or institutions dealing with the management of natural resources have succeeded in installing and operating efficiently such systems. The overheads of streamlining data flows into an MIS, and the complexity of data maintenance to retain the integrity of an MIS system, have been found to be large. ICIMOD is by no means alone in the science and development world in its reluctance to allocate resources into the development of a centralized

MIS. Consequently any PM&E will be less than optimised in such institutions, as facts and figures required for input and analysis will have to be gathered from many – and differently formatted – sources. This Team does recommend, however, that ICIMOD Management reviews its options for an integrated MIS system, possibly by seeking advice from institutes in the CGIAR family, e.g. IFPRI and WorldFish (ICLARM), or the CGIAR Secretariat, or IFAD. The PAC/BoG may wish to offer suggestions to Management on the introduction of an integrated MIS but should appreciate that significant resources are required for its successful implementation and must be made available for this purpose. Considerations must also be made as to the organizational “home” for an MIS system within ICIMOD; several alternatives are possible.

Recommendation 4. We suggest that ICIMOD Board and Management seriously consider the introduction of an integrated Management Information System. This will be very helpful for planning, monitoring and evaluation. We recommend that contact be established with similar organizations to gain from their experience in MIS implementation.

Recommendation 5. Coupled to any decision to implement an MIS should be an adequate budget allocation for this purpose.

Recommendation 6. If – for the time being – an integrated MIS is not implemented, we nevertheless recommend that the on-going implementation of a monitoring and evaluation system is actively continued.

4.2 MONITORING AND EVALUATION

The availability of a well-designed project or programme framework (Planning) is essential for efficient M&E. As outlined above, ICIMOD has achieved this in most recent years (except at central institutional level) but the framework is as yet not standardized and requires further development.

Most M&E literature points, however, to a further need for baseline studies in order to assess impacts of interventions (“before” and “after”) (e.g. see World Bank advice in Rajalahti et al. 2005, p. 10). To ICIMOD’s credit they report to this Team to have repeatedly included – when appropriate - baseline studies in project proposals to donors, only to see them removed in the final budget allocations. This Team shares ICIMOD’s perceptions of the need in many projects for at least elementary baseline studies to precede projects or programmes expected to induce change. Intelligent sampling may often result in low cost baselines and meet donor fears of extensive and expensive surveys or censuses. This Team encourages ICIMOD to persevere in its proposals to give baseline surveys priority, or – when more appropriate – to ascertain “before intervention status” and wishes to remind donors that if there is no factual knowledge of “before”, project achievements “after” may easily become anecdotal.

Recommendation 7. We recommend that ICIMOD in its project proposals to donors continues to stress the value of preceding baseline studies and similar, when appropriate, as monitoring and evaluation without a reference starting point involve much uncertainty.

Recommendation 8. We recommend to donors that they – contrary to common practice – allocate project funding for baseline and similar studies.

During the last 12 months the newly appointed M&E officer has worked on introducing M&E methods in ICIMOD. The achievements have been reviewed by Reichert and Gellert (2005), as part of the ISG/GTZ support to ICIMOD. Our report has revisited much the same documents and talked to many of the same people, and some more, including a sample of national partners in Pakistan, India and Nepal. We have also met with the Board Chair of ICIMOD's BoG, also representing the Nepali donor.

In general we share the conclusions of Reichert and Gellert (*idem*, 2005). Unlike Reichert and Gellert (*idem*) we have also had available significant elements of advance papers to be presented by ICIMOD Management to the ICIMOD BoG in November 2005. We have therefore had opportunities to study in detail the links between the Medium Term Action Plan 2003-2007 (MTAP) (ICIMOD 2003b) and the drafts relating to reporting on a selection of the Integrated Programmes (IPs 2,4,5,6). The intentions for M&E outlined in MTAP (ICIMOD 2003b, pp.100-104) have been further refined, made practical and demonstrated in the available drafts on the IPs. Clear links have been made between the Planning process (LFA framework) and Monitoring and Evaluation. Target Outputs and Outcomes for 2005 are specifically analysed in the form of Indicators. Plans for 2006 are described in a similar form, with qualitative and – where appropriate – quantitative indicators. Achievements have been linked to goals in the MTAP, and to the overarching Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).⁶

The Team has not obtained a good overview of whether linkages established and AI and IP levels can be followed through to institutional goal objectives, e.g. as expressed in MTAP 2003-2007. The Team acknowledges that this may be more evident in the final PAC/BoG 2005 papers than in the draft fragments so far available to the Team.

Much progress has thus been made during the last 12 months, the skeleton of an M&E system is in place, there is general support among programme and project leaders for the implementation of a functional M&E system. National partners also welcome the idea of being linked to a modern M&E system, which will enhance and make more visible their contributions to ICIMOD projects⁷. This may also offer support to more modern project management methods in non-ICIMOD projects in their own

⁶ The value, measurements and directions of the MDGs are currently under debate, with doubts expressed (Shetty, 2005; Attaran, 2005) and refuted (McArthur et al., 2005). There are clearly methodological challenges surrounding MDGs, and ICIMOD may not wish to overstate their contributions to MDGs.

⁷ We have become aware of some resentment among national partners on the attribution issue, i.e. that ICIMOD staff do not in publications attribute enough credit (e.g. in the form of joint authorship) to local partners, who may occasionally get a feeling of becoming degraded to anonymous data collectors. A more formal M&E procedure could be used for fair attributions. The Team has been unable to verify the extent of any such resentment. We acknowledge that the recent activation of a Publication and Outreach Policy may overcome any such weaknesses.

countries⁸. National partners expect that their active and meaningful cooperation in a functional M&E system for ICIMOD can only be assured through training in PM&E methods, analogous to the training in LFA offered earlier by ICIMOD and others.

4.3 SOME METHODOLOGICAL CHALLENGES

Forthcoming BoG papers (for November 2005) also illustrate some of the methodological challenges entailed in PM&E systems. Programmes and projects can have quantitative and qualitative outputs and outcomes. Whilst quantitative outputs in M&E studies have previously been hailed as concrete evidence of success (or otherwise), more qualitative outcomes may be more relevant and appropriate in many projects and programmes. Increasingly there is also awareness that processes and their dynamics may constitute relevant measurement sticks (see World Bank considerations in Rajalahti et al., 2005). The recent literature is significant, and at times bewildering, as institutions and individuals advocate their methods as the most appropriate. In Appendix 2 we have attempted to put together a list of recent and seminal papers reflecting the steadily growing PM&E debate.

Recommendation 9. We recommend that ICIMOD staff familiarize themselves with current thinking on Monitoring and Evaluation, possibly through seminars and workshops, paying particular attention to current trends to give equal emphasis to data pertaining to quality and processes as to traditionally quantitative data and indicators.

Interestingly many donors (and in Appendix 2 we have selected some – but not all - of those that are most relevant for ICIMOD) have developed their own PM&E toolkits that vary in nature. ICIMOD, receiving funding from many donors, and often from several for one programme or project, will inevitably be caught up in the methodological debate, similar to the varying requirements from donors on LFA.

Recommendation 10. As with LFA, we plead with donors and other interested parties not to impose “*their* M&E method” as a condition for funding but to consider the emerging ICIMOD PM&E system on its own merit as tailored to the specific basket of programmes and projects ICIMOD and partners conduct in the region⁹.

As the ICIMOD PM&E methodology develops, a major challenge will emerge as to the daily management of the PM&E system within ICIMOD. Essentially ICIMOD at this moment (October 2005) has only one scientist fully versed in PM&E methodology (the M&E Officer). Whilst we note through the interviews we have conducted that programme managers and project leaders are likely to embrace PM&E

⁸ At national level antiquated PME methods often exist. Suggestions have been made from national partners that the international nature and regional anchorage of ICIMOD may be instrumental in gaining acceptance at national level for the introduction there of modern PME methods.

⁹ The Team has been repeatedly asked by ICIMOD staff as to whether we could recommend *one* M&E system. We have deliberately refrained from doing so, or to suggest whether it should be result-based or otherwise. We have reviewed with them a number of strong candidates from where elements could be chosen, stressing that the ICIMOD M&E system should have recognizable internationally accepted elements to ensure a high comfort level with national and international partners and donors. Within such a framework we believe ICIMOD Management is well placed to further develop the ICIMOD M&E system.

methods in their daily work, the skills to do so successfully must be acquired. A division of tasks is therefore required. The suggestion of this Team would be to enable project leaders and programme managers to acquire the necessary skills through a training programme and an innovative tool kit. The development of the training courses, and the tool kit, will therefore be a major early challenge for the M&E Officer. His responsibilities will further extend to conducting the overall ICIMOD M&E at institutional level, building on the project and programme M&E's received. In his work he will strongly rely on the work of the Programme Officer, also in PPD and his records of projects and programmes and the associated reporting requirements.

Recommendation 11. We recommend that the ICIMOD M&E Officer leads the development of a suitable M&E tool kit and associated training for project leaders and programme managers to enable them to conduct their own M&E at project and programme level.

Recommendation 12. We recommend that the overall M&E of ICIMOD's institution work be assigned to the M&E Officer.

Unlike the earlier M&E development in ICIMOD, the current M&E Officer has been encouraging participatory approaches to M&E. There is a growing literature on participatory M&E (see also footnote 3), see Appendix 2 for an annotated bibliography.

Recommendation 13. We encourage the M&E Officer to continue evaluating participatory M&E methods for an ICIMOD "tool kit".

We believe an innovative tool kit could be considered, which could also serve as a backbone for training courses. The gradual move to more computer-based management systems, both within ICIMOD and partners, would argue for a (possibly rule-based) interactive decision-support system, which on the basis of questions posed or information provided by the project leader or programme manager, would suggest an appropriate design of the elements of the M&E system for the particular purpose. Drawing on a knowledge bank of current methodologies (Appendix 2 contains references to many of the most relevant, accepted and tried methodologies), a flexible M&E system could emerge, with the necessary support functions. Ultimately – in the future – some of this could be linked to a centralized Management Information System. A web-based system is thinkable, and this could also act in support of national partners who interact with ICIMOD, or simply are interested in using ICIMOD methodologies for their own national or local purposes. We believe ICIMOD at the present time has the in-house capabilities of developing such a module. We also envisage that links with its advanced world-class GIS system for the region could ultimately create a spatially-based powerful PM&E system, where project and programme PM&E data can be dynamically linked to spatial data. The development of such a system would incidentally move ICIMOD into the forefront globally of PM&E practitioners.

We do reiterate that the operation of an efficient MIS system will greatly ease M&E in general. If linked to the decision-support system much additional value may be had.

However, we do not think that the introduction of the proposed decision-support system for M&E is contingent on the existence of an integrated MIS.

ICIMOD serves countries where computer-assisted methods are gaining increased support, particularly in India. Within the next 5 years scientific institutions and NGOs will be significantly more conversant with computer-assisted modes of operation and have reasonable access to the WorldWideWeb. Government institutions may still lag behind. A decision-support M&E web-based system may require less basic competency to operate than traditional M&E methods.

Alternative solutions, not involving computer-based decision-support systems and web technologies, are also conceivable. The development of a small book/booklet “handyguide” containing some or many of the elements of an interactive computer-based system could go some way towards standardizing and institutionalising M&E. Combined with a “help desk” function (e.g. operated by the M&E Officer) progress could be achieved.

Recommendation 14. We recommend that ICIMOD considers developing a computer-assisted decision-support system based M&E system, possibly with links to its GIS facility, and considers that it be web-based to encourage its use among national partners. Initially, or alternatively, a book-based “handyguide” combined with a “help desk” function could serve this role.

This Team thus envisages that the responsibilities for M&E report will reside at project and programme levels, and that the coordination of M&E at those levels will be the responsibility of the central M&E Officer. The M&E Officer will himself be responsible for central or institutional M&E, building on the partial M&E reports received. In this way we do not foresee any further needs for additional senior professional human resources to supplement the current M&E Officer’s position; support staff resources may be required. Close cooperation with the Programme Officer, also in PPD, will assist in the development of M&E. Reichert and Gellert (2005, section 5.5) suggest that M&E Officer position in the ICIMOD organizational structure be moved from PPD to the Directorate to report directly to the Deputy Director General (Programmes). As PPD is already a division headed by the DDG (Programmes) and this arrangement appears to function smoothly, we see little need for change. Therefore, and as this is not perceived as an important issue by the ICIMOD personnel concerned, this Team does not consider this an essential element of strengthening ICIMOD M&E.

Recommendation 15. Unlike the GTZ team we do not think that an organizational change in the position of the M&E Officer is central to the introduction of a functional M&E system.

An essential element of future success will be specific budget allocations at project, programme and institutional level for PM&E activities. Budget lines should be specific for PM&E, be earmarked and non-fungible, and adequate for realistic PM&E. Whilst the actual allocation may vary from type of project/programme to another, it would not seem unreasonable to set aside on average about 5% of a project budget for PM&E. In as far as programmes may constitute unions of projects, smaller percentage

may be required at program level, e.g. 2-3%. It is most important that these are specific budget lines and not assumed under “Miscellaneous”.

Recommendation 16. To ensure that M&E activities are considered central to ICIMOD’s work we strongly recommend that a non-fungible budget allocation of approx. 5% is earmarked in project proposals and budgets, and 2-3% in programme budgets for M&E activities.

The Team has specifically interviewed central ICIMOD staff on the proposed 3-year timetable suggested by the GTZ Team (Reichert and Gellert, 2005) for the introduction of M&E methods in ICIMOD, and the associated milestones. We note a general acceptance of this proposal. This Team believes it is very important that ICIMOD staff and Board take ownership of the process, rather than it being imposed from the outside. If ICIMOD is comfortable with a 3 year M&E phasing-in process, then the GTZ Team proposals have much merit. This Team senses, however, an urgency both at Board and donor levels for an early establishment of a viable M&E system in ICIMOD. We see the progress made in the (draft) BoG 2005 papers as an indicator of the ability of ICIMOD to move considerably faster towards institutional M&E than the suggested 3 years. We would like to suggest that much progress could be made in ICIMOD centrally within the next 1.5-2 years, but that the introduction of an effective M&E system with partners may take 3 years or more.

We do believe that the introduction of M&E with partner institutions is a most important element in ensuring quality in partner work. The success of partner projects also reflects positively on ICIMOD. In addition, ICIMOD should as a matter of course include in its own ICIMOD M&E the topic of its own relations with the partner institution.

Recommendation 17. We recommend that the GTZ-proposed 3 year timetable for M&E implementation is revisited, with the aim of shortening the within-ICIMOD time required to 1.5 – 2 years, whilst 3 years or more be considered more relevant for partner institutions.

5. CONCLUSIONS

With the successful introduction of Logical Framework Approaches in the ICIMOD planning process, both at central level and with partners, a good foundation has been laid for the development of effective Monitoring and Evaluation within a relatively short time. Although it would be very advantageous to have had a central Management Information System to underpin M&E activities, and that the development of a central – possibly GIS-linked – MIS should be considered, this Team believes that much progress can be made even in the absence of a central MIS. ICIMOD programme and project activities span a wide spectrum of topics, complexities and geographical space, and a comprehensive M&E tool-kit is required to cater for the diversity of projects. In Appendix 2 we have summarily presented a number of recent seminal publications on M&E, from which we suggest ICIMOD could draw in its construction of the ICIMOD M&E tool-kit. In particular we urge ICIMOD to align itself with good international practices used by leading financing and donor agencies, in order to assure common acceptance among donors for “the

ICIMOD way of doing M&E". We believe that ICIMOD has adequate M&E and associated expertise available within the institution to build an M&E tool-kit for internal and external use. We foresee a possibility that with links to computer-based expert systems and GIS, ICIMOD could attain a front role in the development of M&E for research and development institutions in the developing world. Impressive progress has been made during the last 12 months. The advice voiced by the BoG and others has been heeded by ICIMOD's Management. To support further progress we have in the text of this report offered some recommendations (summarized in the Executive Summary) that we hope will be of assistance both to ICIMOD, its partners and supporters.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The generous cooperation of ICIMOD staff in this evaluation is gratefully acknowledged, with particular thanks to Gabriel Campbell, Madhav Karki and Farid Ahmad. The latter also facilitated the flawless logistics of our visit. We thank officers of the Royal Norwegian Embassy in Kathmandu, especially H.E. Ambassador Tore Toreng and Margaret Myklebust for their guidance, and Ivar Jørgensen of Norad, Oslo, for the care he took to define this project. We are most grateful to H.E. Prof. Ram Prasad Chaudhary of the National Planning Commission, Kathmandu, for his views, both as the ICIMOD Board Chair, and representing the Nepali donor to ICIMOD.

REFERENCES

- Ahmad, F. 2004.* An Overview Paper on PME system of International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development. Draft. ICIMOD, Kathmandu
- Attaran, A. 2005.* Millennium Development Goals Doomed to Fail. www.scidev.net 13 Sept 2005
- ICIMOD 2003a.* Partnerships in Sustainable Mountain Development. Kathmandu
- ICIMOD 2003b.* ICIMOD Medium Term Action Plan 2003-2007. Kathmandu
- ICIMOD 2004.* 1983-2004 An Internal Assessment of ICIMOD's Achievements, Challenges and Lessons Learnt. Kathmandu
- Norad 1990* (with revisions 1996, 1999). The Logical Framework Approach (LFA). Oslo
- QQR 2001.* Third Quinquennial Review of ICIMOD. Kathmandu
- McArthur, J., Sachs, J. & Schmidt-Traub 2005.* Millennium Development Goals 'not doomed to fail'. www.scidev.net 13 Sept 2005
- Rajalahti, R., Weoelcke, J. & Pehu, E. 2005.* Monitoring and Evaluation for World Bank Agricultural Research and Extension Projects: A Good Practice Note. WB Agric.Rural Dev.Disc.Paper 20. Washington, DC.
- Reichert, C. & Gellert, M. 2005.* Strengthening ICIMOD Monitoring & Evaluation. Concepta Team GbR. Gelnhausen/Kathmandu
- Shetty, P. 2005.* Progress on UN development goals 'can't be measured'. www.scidev.net 13 Sept 2005
- Sिताला, B. 2005.* Report from participation in ICIMOD International Support Group (ISG) and Board meeting Dec. 4-9. Norwegian University of Life Sciences, Ås.
- Vernon, R. 2001.* Knowing Where You're Going: Information Systems for Agricultural Research Management. ISNAR, The Hague
- Vernooy, R., Qiu, S. & Jianchu, X. 2006.* The power of participatory monitoring and evaluation: insights from South-west China. *Development in Practice*, Vol. 16, No. 5 (in press).

APPENDIX 1

Terms of Reference

Mid Term Review of Norwegian Support to ICIMOD 2002-2007

1. Background

Norway has contributed to the funding of ICIMOD over a number of years. Initial support was for two specified projects, more recent support has been for the Regional Collaborative Programmes and the Medium Term Plans as untied programme support. The level of funding is currently around 500' USD per annum. The agreement between Norway and ICIMOD specifies the intention to undertake reviews during the period of funding. The current funding agreement is for the period 2003-2007, which coincides with the Medium Term Plan. Previous planning cycles in ICIMOD has been for 4 years, while the overall evaluation cycle as initiated by the Board of Governors (BOG) has been for 5 years, causing a lack of match between evaluation timing and planning cycles. Several donor-initiated reviews have been implemented over the years, normally for specific projects. The Quinquennial reviews (QQR) have been implemented three times in the 22 years lifespan of the institution, the most recent one in 2001. The fourth QQR is due in 2006.

The current review will focus on one key set of issues that has been in focus also in previous evaluations: *planning, monitoring and evaluation* (PME). It will be a mini-review in terms of time use and evaluation team, and it will be used by Norway in its monitoring of the ongoing funding to ICIMOD, and it may also be of value for other donors and for the upcoming QQR. The need for improvements in the M&E system has been highlighted in previous evaluations and has been discussed repeatedly in Board meeting and ISG meetings.

2. Scope of the Review

The consultant will review the reports from previous evaluations and decisions taken by the Board and relevant committees in ICIMOD regarding PME. Against this background, the team will review current status of PME in ICIMOD and the plans made for further development of these systems. The consultants will also give recommendations on how to proceed in this process.

The team will consult with ICIMOD staff and with ICIMOD partners if and when relevant. The team will also consult with other donor representatives as necessary. The team will look into PME activities at different stages of the planning cycle, and relate observations and analysis to one or a few sample Action Initiatives (AIs) or projects.

3. Issues to be Covered

The QQR from 2001 concluded that PME systems remained with substantial weaknesses. The review recommended 5 actions to improve the situation (QQR III, p.88):

- clarify planning terminology;
- install a medium term PME process;

- conceptualise a systematic and coherent programme for the next Regional Collaborative Programme (RCP);
- devise a planning process ensuring integration between divisions and involvement of partners;
- develop a sound indicator system.

The recent annual plans of ICIMOD have contained various actions for improving the PME system. The Annual plan for ICIMOD for 2005 contains the AI 5.02: Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E). This Action Initiative will in 2005 according to the plan focus on three main areas:

- Establishment of M&E System including finalization of IP-level performance indicators and frameworks, and testing of a fully operational IP-level M&E system on two major on-going projects.
- Capacity building and training on the M&E system with ICIMOD staff and key partners
- Facilitation of M&E routine through establishing a Centre-wide management information system, adoption of M&E procedures in all new project proposals, and assessing the efficiency and effectiveness of selected program initiatives.

The Board of Governors (BOG) and International Support Group (ISG) have commented on PME on several occasions. The team is expected to review ICIMODs follow up of the above plans and recommendations, identify obstacles to progress on these issues, and give recommendations on the way forward in order to fulfil the ambitions as expressed in plans and BOG decisions.

The team is also expected to discuss the special situation of ICIMOD as a knowledge institutions working through partnerships and the effect that this may have on the requirements to a PME system. The levels of planning and monitoring (e.g. ICIMOD level and partner level) should be recognised in this discussion. The focus should be PME at ICIMOD level, and the need for ICIMOD to relate to and possibly assist the upgrading of partner systems for PME. The special PME-relevant challenges related to the role of ICIMOD in many projects as a catalyst rather than an implementing agent should also be discussed. The effect of ICIMODs funding situation with a considerable share of project specific funding should also be assessed in relation to effects this may have on the possibilities for planning and monitoring. Similarly the effect on PME of joint funding situations where partners contribute in kind or cash should be assessed.

4. Evaluation Team

The team will consist of Dr Stein Bie, Noragric (Team Leader) and Ms Marte Qvenild, Noragric (Trainee).

5. Timetable, Budget and Reporting

The team will undertake field work during October 2nd to 9th 2005, and will submit a draft report by October 17th. Following comments from ICIMOD, the Royal Norwegian Embassy and NORAD, a final report will be submitted by October 28th. The total time allocated for the team is 14 working days plus travel time. The budget for the review is appendix 1; Noragric will cover the salary for Qvenil all other expenses pertaining to the review will be covered by Norad.

Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation in ICIMOD

The report will be submitted in English, and will be of a maximum of 15 pages plus relevant annexes. The team will meet with RNE for briefing and/or debriefing during the assignment. Ownership to the report is regulated in the frame agreement between Norad and Noragric.

Kathmandu, 14.09.2005

Tore Toreng
Ambassador

APPENDIX 2

Review of recent literature on Monitoring and Evaluation

There are many recipes on how to best plan, monitor and evaluate projects undertaken in developing countries. International organization and donors all have their philosophies on how to ensure transparency and successful results of how their funds are being spent. Most importantly, however, is how frameworks for planning, monitoring and evaluation can help scientists and development workers through the process of project implementation in a structured way. The challenge may be to find a framework that is simple enough to be useful, and complex enough to serve different needs.

A shift from focus on outputs to outcomes and processes

There is increasing focus on the results of development projects, increased focus from donors on impact, outcomes and processes rather than on reporting inputs, activities and production of outputs. These do not give a good understanding of the success or failure of development interventions.

The 'P' in PM&M has at least two meanings

- Planning

Planning is 'a process for setting organizational goals and establishing the resources needed to achieve them' (Horton et al. 1993)

- Participatory

'Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation differs from more conventional approaches to monitoring and evaluation in that it seeks to engage the project stakeholders more actively in reflecting and assessing the progress of their project and in particular the achievement of results.' (Coupal 2001) Used by...The World Bank, CIDA, NRSP

Indicators in M&E

The indicator or performance indicator is considered an essential ingredient in the M&E process as it provides a way to keep an overview of progress, identify results, and enable project managers to take corrective action to keep projects or programmes on the right track. The indicators measure achievements and performance against the desired results and goals. Different types of indicators are used to track the achievements of a development intervention and can be both quantitative and qualitative depending on the nature of the intervention.

LFA and Results Framework

The Logical Framework provides an overview of the logical sequence between the overall objective of a project, programme or policy and the expected casual links between inputs, outputs, outcomes and impacts. The Log Frame allows project managers and decision-makers to focus on fundamental questions and analyse assumptions and risks.

The Results Framework is a simplified version of the Log Frame and focuses on 'intermediate outcomes expected from implementing each individual project

component, which contributes to the overall achievement of the Project Development Objective' (Rajalahti, R., Woelcke, J., Pehu, E. 2005: 7). By adding focus on component outcomes the Results Framework orient management and design towards results, rather than simply reporting on output production.

A lot has happened the recent years in the field of PM&E and most donor agencies have their own toolkit or preferences. Below is an outline of different framework and tools developed by various actors in the field of development.

Some seminal papers from ISNAR

Training in Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation for Agricultural Research Management, Manuals 1 to 4 (ISNAR 1995)

ISNAR developed the groundbreaking manuals for Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation through its project 'Strengthening Agricultural Research Management in Latin America and the Caribbean'. Reference books, training modules, and training manuals were developed to address the lack of well defined strategies and the fact that many agricultural research institution in fact failed to understand and cope coherently with problems, or 'the chain of crises' they were facing (ISNAR, Manual 1, 1995: 4). The manuals focused on the Strategic Approach in Agricultural Research Management, Strategic Planning, Strategic Monitoring and Evaluation.

The recent years ISNAR developed its PM&E approach further and the concept *capacity development* is central. Capacity development is a flexible term that can signify various things, and one way to define it is as the 'process by which individuals, groups and organizations improve their ability to carry out their functions and achieve desired results over time' (Peter Morgan in Horton 2002: 2). The definition illustrate development capacity as an 'internal process of growth and development, and that capacity-development efforts should be result oriented.' (ibid.). In January 2000, ISNAR started an 'Evaluating Capacity Development' project that through evaluation seek to improve capacity development efforts in research and development organizations.

Some of the papers on capacity development more recently published by ISNAR are:

- *Developing and Evaluating Capacity in Research and Development Organizations* (Horton et al 2003)
- *Capacity Development in Planning, Monitoring, and Evaluation: Results of An Evaluation* (Mackay and Horton 2002)
- *Planning, implementing, and evaluating capacity development* (Horton 2002)
- *Evaluating Capacity Development in Planning, Monitoring, and Evaluation – A case form agricultural research* (Horton et al 2000)

The paper *Ten Tools for Managing Change in National Agricultural Research Organizations* (Hobbs 1999) suggest different tools for how national agricultural research organizations can improve their management skills in processes of change.

Other contributions

The power of participatory monitoring and evaluation: insights from South-west China (Vernooy et al., to be published in 2006)

The article focus on ongoing participatory research in China, and emphasize the power of participatory M&E as a tool for various stakeholders to share successes and short-comings and contributing to the slow process of socio-political change in China. One of the authors is a senior ICIMOD staff member.

'Monitoring and Evaluation: Some Tools, Methods and Approaches' (The World Bank, 2004. Washington, DC.)

The report offers tools, methods and approaches for monitoring and evaluation such as performance indicators, the logical framework approach theory-based evaluation, formal surveys, rapid appraisal method, participatory methods, public expenditure tracking surveys, cost-benefit and cost-effectiveness analysis and impact evaluation. The different tools are explained in a simple and straight forward manner focusing on a short explanation of each tool, what they can be used for, advantages and disadvantages of each tool and a comment about the likely cost of using the tool, as well as the skills and time required.

In addition the guide outlines examples of impact evaluation designs.

Monitoring and Evaluation for World Bank Agricultural Research and Extension Projects: A Good Practice Note (Rajalahti, R., Woelcke, J., Pehu, E. 2005 World Bank, Washington, DC)

The 'Good Practice Note' provides a step-by-step guide for developing a monitoring and evaluation system for agricultural research and extension (ARE) systems, with an emphasis on World Bank practices and requirements. The Note contains the following steps:

1. Challenges for M&E Systems in Agricultural Research and Extension Projects
2. The World Bank Results Framework Requirements
 - 2.1 From the Log Frame to the Results Framework
 - 2.2 Developing the Results Framework (including selection of indicators)
3. Data Collection, Reporting, and Dissemination Requirements
 - 3.1 Monitoring and Evaluation Plan
 - 3.2 Project Management Information System
 - 3.3 Institutional and Human Capacity in Project M&E
 - 3.4 Data Sources and Methodology for Data Collection and Analysis
 - 3.5 Monitoring and Evaluation Costs
4. Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation
5. Evaluation of Outcomes and Impact in the World Bank
6. Economic Evaluation of Competitive Grants Schemes

The Good Practice Note offers a new approach to M&E as it focuses on the tracking of results rather than simply monitoring implementation by tracking inputs, activities undertaken and outputs delivered. The *Results-based* model adds to the traditional implementation focused system by adding focus on project outcomes and impacts. The Note emphasize the importance of adapting a participatory approach to M& E where key stakeholder can both learn and affect the process and impact of a development intervention, as the success of development interventions often depend

largely on the involvement of stakeholders in the planning, implementation and evaluation process.

Evaluation Capacity Development- Building Country Capacity for Monitoring and Evaluation in the Public Sector: Selected Lessons of International Experience (Schiavo-Campo 2005, World Bank, Washington, DC)

The paper deals with the building of country capacity for monitoring and evaluation in the public sector and draws on findings from two country case studies, Egypt and Uganda. It outlines lessons about what works, what does not, and why.

Guidance on using Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (PM&E) for NRSP Projects (NRSP 2004)

The documents gives an overview of PM&E as opposed to traditional M&E and explains how PM&E can be used in NRSP project, and gives a general definition of the extent of participation in PM&E. Further two practical case studies are used to give researchers ideas on how to implement PM&E. It outlines principles of good indicator designs and methods for data collection, analysis and reflection.

DFID Monitoring and Evaluation information and communication for development programmes (DFID 2005)

The DFID guidelines are specially developed for DFID programmes and offers advice on monitoring and evaluation and describes various approaches at different stages in a development programme.

Guidance is structured around the programmed cycle:

- Section 1 - things to think about before you start
- Section 2 - planning and budgeting
- Section 3 - monitoring and evaluation at the start of your programmed
- Section 4 - methods for ongoing monitoring and evaluation
- Section 5 - measuring impacts and outcomes at the end of your programmed
- Section 6 - introduces the tools of good practice
- Sources of further information are contained in Section 7

Development Cooperation Manual (Norad 2005)

The Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs has developed the Manual primarily for staff at Norwegian Embassies and Norad staff, but may also be useful to Partners and other donors on Norwegian requirements and conditions for financial and technical support. It outlines key principles, procedures and standard working methods in different phases of a programme cycle from the planning to the implementation and complementation stages of a development intervention.

Managing for Impact in Rural Development: A Guide for Project M&E (IFAD 2002, Rome)

The guide was developed to improve the quality of M&E in IFAD-supported projects. It presents ideas on how to ensure various forms of participatory M&E in development interventions. The Guide has been written for managers, M&E staff, consultants, and IFAD and cooperating institution staff. The section 'Navigating the Guide' helps the reader to find the appropriate sections of the guide most appropriate for his or her needs. 34 different methods for M&E are presented.

Evaluation Planning in Program Initiatives (IDRC 2004)

The guideline reviews the role of evaluation in IDRC and includes the required elements for evaluation plans. It provides an overview of Evaluation Planning, suggests the format of Evaluation Plans for Program Initiatives, which include the Evaluation Issue, Intended Users and Use, Audience, Responsible Officer, Timing and Cost.

Sida Evaluation Manual: Looking Back, Moving Forward (Sida 2004)

The book reviews concepts central to evaluation of poverty reduction and provides a step-by-step guide to the evaluation process from decision-making to the dissemination of results.

Sida's Evaluation Policy (Sida 1999)

The document describes Sida's evaluation activities and emphasizes the principles of learning (promotion) and accountability (control).

A Review of Evaluation in DANIDA (Ministry of Foreign Affairs 2003)

The report reviews the current state of Evaluation Secretariat and actions to be taken to strengthen its evaluation function.

Results-based Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (Coupal 2001)

This article is a part of a special series on Participatory Evaluation published by CIDA. It focuses the involvement of stakeholders in all dimensions of the project cycle and addresses the following questions:

- What is the difference between conventional monitoring and evaluation and Results-based Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation?
- What is the purpose of PM&E?
- How do I go about undertaking a PM&E?

The Logical Framework (Norad 1990,1996,1999)

The handbook provides an overview of the key elements to be included in a Logical Framework and describes how LFA can be used as a tool when planning and implementing projects.

List of references:

Coupal, F. 2001, Result-based Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation. CIDA's Performance Review Branch. www.mosaic-net-intl.ca/article-PM&E.pdf.

DANIDA (Danish International Development Agency) / Ministry of Foreign Affairs 2003, A Review of Evaluation in DANIDA, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

DFID (Department for International Development) 2005, Monitoring and Evaluating Information and Communication for Development Programmes. Guidelines March 2005, Information and Communication for Development.
<http://www.dfid.gov.uk/pubs/files/icd-guidelines.pdf>

Horton, D., Ballantyne, P., Peterson, W., Uribe, B., Gapasin, D., Sheridan, K. 1993, Monitoring and evaluating agricultural research: A sourcebook. CAB International in association with ISNAR: Wallingford.

IDRC (International Development Research Centre) 2004, Evaluation Planning in Program Initiatives, Evaluation Guideline 2. www.idrc.ca/en/ev-58451-201-1-DO_TOPIC.html

IFAD (International Fund for Agricultural Development) *year?*, Managing for Impact in Rural Development – A Guide for Project M&E.
<http://www.ifad.org/evaluation/guide/index.htm>

ISNAR (International Service for National Agricultural Research) and CIAT (International Centre for Tropical Agriculture) 1995, Training in Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation for Agricultural Research Management:

Gálvez, S., Novoa, A.R., de Souza Silva, L.T., Villegas, M. Manual 1 Strategic Approach

Borges-Andrade, J. E., Escobar, M. D., Palomino, J., Saldaña, R., Silva, J. S. Manual 2 Strategic Planning

Bojanic, A., Hareau, G, Posada, R., Ruiz, A. M. , Solis, E. Manual 3 Monitoring

Granger, A., Grierson, J., Quirino, Romano, L., Manual 4 Evaluation

Other ISNAR publications:

Horton, D et al. 2003, Developing and Evaluating Capacity in Research and Development Organizations, ISNAR Briefing Paper 62, September 2003

Mackay, R. and Horton, D. 2002, Capacity Development in Planning, Monitoring, and Evaluation: Results of An Evaluation. ISNAR Briefing Paper 51, July 2002

Horton, D. 2002, Planning, implementing, and evaluating capacity development. ISNAR Briefing Paper 50, July 2002

Horton, D. et al 2000, Evaluating Capacity Development in Planning, Monitoring, and Evaluation – A case form agricultural research. ISNAR Research Report 17

Hobbs, S. H. 1999, Ten Tools for Managing Change in National Agricultural Research Organizations. ISNAR January 1999

NARS (Natural Resources Systems Programme) 2004, Guidance on using Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (PM&E) for NRSP Projects. GY Associates Ltd. www.nrsp.co.uk/Nrspweb/publications/PD109_PM&E%20Toolkit.pdf.

Norad (Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation) 1996 third edition, The Logical Framework Approach (LFA) – A handbook for objectives-oriented planning. Norad

Rajalahti, R., Woelcke, J., Pehu, E. 2005, Monitoring and Evaluation for World Bank Agricultural Research and Extension Projects: A Good Practice Note. Agricultural and Rural Development Discussion Paper 20 The World Bank

Schiavo-Campo, S. 2005, Evaluation Capacity Development – Building Country Capacity for Monitoring and Evaluation in the Public Sector: Selected Lessons of International Experience. ECD Working Paper Series No 13: June 2005, The World Bank Operations Evaluation Department

Sida (Swedish Agency for International Development Cooperation) 2004, Looking Back, moving Forwards – Sida Evaluation Manual. Evaluation & International Audit. SIDA 3753en

Sida(Swedish Agency for International Development Cooperation) 1999, Sida's Evaluation Policy. Department for Evaluation and Internal Audit.

The World Bank 2004, Monitoring and Evaluation: Some Tools, Methods and Approaches. World Bank Operations Evaluation Department – Evaluation Capacity Development. www.worldbank.org/oed/ecd

Vernooy, R., Qui, S., Jianchu, X. to be published in 2006, The power of participatory monitoring and evaluation: insights from South-west China. Development in Practice, Volume 16 No. 5

APPENDIX 3

Review Team Itinerary

(Kathmandu visit, 1-10 October, 2005)

Stein W. Bie and Marte Qvenild

- 01 October Depart Norway 30 September. Arrive (via London and Abu Dhabi) in Kathmandu. Received at the airport by ICIMOD's M&E Officer.
- 02 October Meet with DG, DDG-P and M&E Officer at Summit Hotel.
Study of relevant documents
- 03 October Meeting with Margaret Myklebust at Norwegian Embassy
Meeting with DG, DDG-P and Programme Managers at ICIMOD
Meeting with Beekeeper Group from Pokhara at ICIMOD
Meeting with PARDYP Project Team at ICIMOD
Dinner with ICIMOD staff at Summit Hotel at ICIMOD
- 04 October Meeting with Programme Manager, WHEM at ICIMOD
Field visit to ICIMOD's Godavri Test and Demonstration Site
Lunch with DDG-P and Program Managers at Godavri Village Resort
Meeting with DDG-P at ICIMOD
Meeting with DG at ICIMOD
- 05 October Talk by Stein W. Bie on "Linking Research with Policy" at ICIMOD
Meeting with IKM at ICIMOD
Meeting with MENRIS Division at ICIMOD
Meeting with CEGG at ICIMOD
Meeting with ARID at ICIMOD
- 06 October Study and further analysis of M&E system at ICIMOD
Meeting with Norwegian Ambassador at Norwegian Embassy
Dinner with DG
- 07 October Meeting with ICIMOD Partner from Pakistan at ICIMOD
Meeting with ICIMOD Partner from India at ICIMOD
Lunch with DG and DDG-P
Meeting with Chair of ICIMOD's BoG at the National Planning Commission
Wrap-up session with Programme Managers
- 08 October Report Writing at Summit Hotel
- 09 October Report Writing at Summit Hotel
- 10 October Wrap-up meeting with DG, DDG-P and M&E Officer at Summit Hotel
Return travel to Norway via Abu Dhabi and London (arr. 11 October)

APPENDIX 4

List of interviewees

ICIMOD Staff

Gabriel Campbell

Director General,
Directorate

Madhav Karki

Deputy Director General – Programmes,
Directorate

Farid Ahmad

Monitoring and Evaluation Officer,
Policy and Partnership Development

Eklabya Sharma

Prog. Manager/ Sr. Natural Resources Specialist,
Natural Resource Management

Roger White

Reg. Prog. Coordinator/ Watershed Mngt. Specialist, PARDYP
Natural Resource Management

Sanjeev K. Bhuchar

Asst. Prog. Coordinator/ Social Forester PARDYP,
Natural Resource Management

Samden Lama Sherpa

Godavri Centre Management,
Natural Resource Management

Kamal Banskota

Programme Manager/ Senior Environment/ Resource Economist,
Agricultural and Rural Income Diversification

Farooq Ahmad

Project Coordinator, Beekeeping,
Agricultural and Rural Income Diversification

Farmers from Beekeeper Group from Pokhara

Agricultural and Rural Income Diversification

Xu Jianchu

Programme Manager/ Ethro-ecologist,
Water, Hazard and Environmental Management

Zbigniew Mikolajuk

Programme Manager/ Knowledge Management
Information and Knowledge Management

Basanta Shresta

Division Head/ System Specialist
IKM/ Mountain Environment and Natural Resources Information Systems

Nani Ram Subedi

Coordinator
Culture, Equity, Gender and Governance

Radhika Gupta

Coordinator, Equity and Rights
Culture, Equity, Gender and Governance

Board of Governors

Ram Prasad Chaudhary

Chair of ICIMOD's Board of Governors
Member, National Planning Commission
His Majesty's Government
Nepal

ICIMOD Partners

Abdoul Wahid Jasra

Director,
Range Management and Forestry
Pakistan Agricultural Research Council
Natural Resources Division

Dhrupad Choudhury

G.B. Institute of Himalayan Environment and Development
N. E. Unit
Arunachal Pradesh
India