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# About ROPE

*The Real-time outcome planning and evaluation (ROPE), the Ten Actions (TAct) and the Cross-Cultural partnership (CCP have been developed by Assoc. Prof. Cecilia ÖMAN Founder of Action10 and of Human Rights and Science, and are the property of Human Rights and Science. CCP has been developed in collaboration with Mr Peter ROPERT at Grace Project Sweden (GPS) and are thus co-owned by GPS. Cecilia started developing the tools in 2009 and they have been continuously developed ever since. It is a never ending process, as lessons are continuously learnt and support, ideas, advice and challenges provided by partners, colleagues and friends keep requesting for modifications, and thus hopefully improvements.*

*This document can be downloaded as PDF from* [*www.humanrightsandscience.se*](http://www.humanrightsandscience.se)*. A word document, where the template can be filled in, can be requested from www.humanrightsandscience.se. If the user is person or an institution from a higher income country then HR&S charges a fee. HR&S offers seminars on the use of ROPE and the Ten Actions (TAct) and well as workshops, where the participants own programmes are designed according to ROPE. HR&S also offers workshops on the topic of cross cultural partnership awareness rising.*
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# Introduction

*The programme journal shall preferably be evaluated twice a year, due 30 June and 31 December. The evaluation is either done during face-to-face meetings or through a Skype calls. The December evaluation shall be included in the Annual report and for Action10 programmes, it shall be presented at the March General Assembly (GA). The PP can always adjust the outcome challenges and the progress markers in relation to lessons-learnt and the realities on the ground.*

*The operation builds on a sequence of monitoring and evaluation events, for with dates, participants and results are recorded. Lessons learnt from the monitoring and evaluation exercises are fed into the programme design revisions.*

*The monitoring starts at the same time as the design of the programme. The first task is to identify the baseline of the programme; the presentation of the situation prior to the start of the programme. Progress marker and Ten Action scorings together with the related comments are compiled in the Monitoring data sheet.*

*Scoring method in short  
Please find details about scoring in the appendices.*

***5 Excellent 90 – 100%***

***4 Good 70 – 90%***

***3 Adequate*** *30 – 70 %*

***2 Poor 10 – 30 %***

***1 No performance*** *0 – 10 %*

### *Please note*

* *The sign \* behind a scoring signifies that the outcome was achieved as a result of the outputs of other actors than the PPs*
* *If the number of Target partners is increasing with time they should be grouped; Group one may for example include the 300 TPs entered the programme during a period of two years. If the number of individuals in Target partner group increases with time then the scoring of each group is indicated in the scoring box, separated by commas.*
* *Scoring based on percentage supersedes scoring based on words. Thus, when a progress marker can be assessed with a percentage, then this is what the scoring shall be based on.*

## The ROPE evaluation planning structure

ROPE is composed of three chapters, Design, Monitoring, and Evaluation planning. The Design and Monitoring guidelines are presented elsewhere.

Each evaluation session (except the baseline) is composed of seven sections:

1. Logistics of the evaluation planning session.

2. Compilation of monitoring data collected on site.

3. Evaluation planning summary.

4. Summary of Journals.

5. Stories.

6. Budget.

7. Additional information.

The evaluation planning journals are five: Outcome Journal, Output mapping Journal, Sustainable economy Journal, Institutional capacity Journal, Ten Actions Journal.

## General comments about this evaluation

Text

## Evaluation planning frequencies

The evaluation planning is preferably done twice a year. In face-to-face meetings or as skype events.

# Evaluation events and summaries

## Monitoring Baseline - Event No 0

The baseline monitoring informs about the situation prior to the initiation of the programme.

Evaluated period:

### Notes:

### Logistics

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Activity | Date of activity | Site / Venue | Persons in charge/attending | Method | Comment |
| Collecting  on-site data |  |  |  | *Field observations and interviews* |  |
| Scoring1 |  |  |  |  |  |

1 The basic Progress markers were in actual practice monitored after the initiation of the programme, thereafter the baseline scoring was in addition added as new Progress markers were included.

### State of the art

## Evaluation planning Event No 1

Evaluated period:Text…

**Notes:**  Text…

**Summary:**  Text…

### Logistics of the evaluation planning session

| Activity | Date of activity | Site / Venue | Persons in charge / attending | Method | Comment |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Collecting  on-site data |  |  | Programme partner, Action10 volunteer | Field observations, interviews | Addressing outcome challenges, progress markers and Programme partner annual report |
| Updating progress markers |  |  | Programme partner |  |  |
| Scoring |  |  |  | Action Tool |  |
| Evaluation planning session |  |  | Programme partners together |  | On-site or Skype |
|  |  |  | PPs and TPs together |  |  |
|  |  |  | PPs and SPs together |  |  |
| Updating programme journal |  |  | Cecilia |  |  |

### Compilation of monitoring data collected on site

| Activity | Date of activity | Site / Venue | Persons in charge / attending | Method | Comment |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Progress markers scoring and comments |  |  | TCPP | Field observations, interviews | See appendix |
| Proposes new activities addressing Progress markers that scores low |  |  | TCPP | Action Tool |  |
| Lessons learnt |  |  | TCPP | Action Tool |  |
| Proposed follow-up meetings |  |  |  |  | If required |
| Other |  |  | PPs and SPs together |  |  |
| Method of sharing the data with Action10 |  |  |  |  | Face-face meeting, Skype or e-mail |

### Evaluation planning summary

| Activity | Text | Comment |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Input |  |  |
| Coordination with Authorities and NDP |  |  |
| Funds |  |  |
| Work hours |  |  |
| Output |  |  |
| Workshops | Number of workshops and number of participants in each |  |
| Awareness rising event | Number of awareness rising event and number of participants |  |
|  |  |  |
| Outcome |  |  |
| Health service provided | Number of persons benefitting from health services in centres built by the programme |  |
| Social enterprises initiated | Number of persons running successful enterprises |  |
| Education provided | Number of persons attending school and managing the exams |  |
| Safe drinking water provided | Number of persons benefitting from having access safe drinking water |  |
|  |  |  |
| Impact |  |  |
| Life quality improvement | Number of persons claiming they have higher quality of life | Questions and replies must be structured |
| Policy changes |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Lessons learnt |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Programme redesign proposed |  | Added to DESIGN document / Comment |
|  |  |  |
| Follow-up activities proposed |  | Added to DESIGN document / Comment |
|  |  |  |
| Volunteer support needed | Volunteers shall only spend time with the Programme partner is a specific need is identified that the volunteer has skills to address |  |
|  | FAA coaching |  |
|  | Social media coaching |  |
|  | Expert knowledge sharing on a specific topic identified by the PPs |  |
|  | Training and workshops with the TPs |  |
|  | Sharing the workload of daily programmes |  |
| Visibility |  |  |
|  | Social media |  |
|  | Distributed printed material / annual report |  |
|  | Distributed visibility items / pens, hats, T-shirts |  |
|  | Media |  |
|  | Visibility events |  |
|  | Campaigns |  |
| Overall comment |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Summary of Journals

*The different Journals are developed in the chapters below, only the different summaries are presented here.*

| Activity | Text | Comment |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Outcome Journal |  | Often developed by volunteers on-site |
|  |  |  |
| Progress markers scoring high1 |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Progress markers scoring low1 |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Identify Change(s) of scale |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Output mapping Journal |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Sustainable economy Journal |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Institutional capacity Journal |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Ten Actions Journal |  |  |
|  |  |  |

1 During a significant period of time.

### Stories

Stories are collected from the target partners in order to understand as much as possible from their point of views.

### Budget

Compile the budget for the coming year.

### Additional information

| Activity | Text | Comment |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# Journals

The evaluation planning includes five Journals to structure the procedures; the Outcome, the Output mapping, the Sustainable economy, the Institutional capacity journal and the Ten Action journal.

## Outcome journal

*The Outcome journal monitors the progress of each Target partner towards the achievement of outcomes.* *Progress markers scorings together with clarifying comments are compiled in the Monitoring Data sheet, first section, if large in volume. If not so large in volume then the progress markers are compiled in the below table.*

### Method

1. Score Progress markers
   * Compile the progress markers in the Monitoring Data Sheet, first section (excel),  
      or if the volume is small enough, in the below table (word).
   * Give each Progress marker a running number
   * Compile the scoring of each progress marker
   * Compile short comments adding information to scorings when appropriate
2. Compile outcomes   
   and related parameters in the table below

### Scoring outcome

Scores 1-5 (1= Low, 5 = High)

| **Monitoring event No / Scores** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **Explanation of the rating** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Scores 1-5 (1= Low, 5 = High) |  | | | | | |
| **Target Partner**: 1: **XX** | | | | | | |
| **Level 1; More easy to achieve** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Level 2** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Level 3** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Target Partner 2:: XX** | | | | | | |
| **Level 1; More easy to achieve** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Level 2** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Level 3** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Target Partner 3:: XX** | | | | | | |
| **Level 1; More easy to achieve** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Level 2** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Level 3** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

### 

### Outcome journal compilation

*Translate the progress marker scoring into words in the Table below.*

Achieved outcomes are defined as those scoring 4 and 5, whereas not achieved outcomes are those scoring 1 and 2. Note the Number of the Evaluation event when this outcome was registered and when if the achievement was the result of an intervention by a strategic partner. Present the evidence for achieved and unanticipated outcomes and the assumed reasons for not achieved outcomes:

| Activities | Description | Comment | Event No 1 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Achieved outcomes 2 | *Present evidence* | **Evidence** |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Not achieved outcomes 3 | *Present evidence* | **Reason** |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Unanticipated Outcome | *Present evidence and the factor causing the outcome* | **Evidence** |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Achieved outcome by Strategic partner |  | **Evidence** |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Identify Change(s) of scale | *Give each change a name and number and identify the progress markers it refers to* |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Description of change |  |  |  |
| Free text |  |  |  |
| Contributing factors |  |  |  |
| Contributing actors |  |  |  |
| Sources of evidence |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Lessons learnt |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Reactions |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Modifications of DESIGN |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| New activities or  follow-ups |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Supporting documents | Compilation of supporting documents, such a questionnaires |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

1 Note the Number(s) of the Evaluation event(s) when this outcome was registered

2 Score 4 and 5

3 Score 1 and 2

## Output mapping journal

*The Output mapping journal addresses the degree to which the implemented Outputs respons to the Target partner’s needs.* *The generic format includes the outputs (activities undertaken), inputs (resources allocated) including funding, work hours, advice and consultancy; and any required follow-up. It can also be customized to include specific elements that the programme wants to monitor.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Output | Input | Required follow-up | Comment / Evidence | Event No |
| Outputs implemented |  |  |  | Evidence |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Outputs not implemented |  |  |  | Evidence |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unanticipated activities |  |  |  | Assumed reason |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Activities resulting from SP interventions |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lessons learnt |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reactions |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Changes in Output mapping |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other changes of DESIGN Journal |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

#### 

## Sustainable economy journal

This Journal evaluates the sustainability of the economy. The journal compiles the information from the financial reports.

Currency: *Identify currency.* Supporting documents: *Annual financial reports etc*

### Financial report summary in numbers

#### Income

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Year | Programme partners |  |  |  |  |  | Strategic partners |  |  |  |  |
|  | Source | Type of income 1 | Amount | Total per year | Activity | Comment | Source | Type of income | Amount | Total per year | Activity |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1 Seed money, investment, interest, sales of products or services provided by Action10 or HRS.

* Action10 support the start up of programmes through seed-money. These programme costs are expected to be covered by programme income and/or the national or local authorities with time.
* The TCPP earns income from the interest of giving out investment capital provided by Action10 l to TPs. Action10 proposes 10% interest. The funds are to be paid back after a time period agreed on by the PPs and TPs together, and is immediately reinvested. PP can in addition extract 7% of the transfers from Action10 to co-fund programme running costs.
* HumanRightsScience provides investment capital for the initiation of social businesses by the TCPP and HRS together. The TCPP is expected to generate an income which will fund or co-fund the local and Swedish running costs of the joint programme including salaries. The investment is to be paid back within one year or if otherwise agreed. As soon as funds are re paid it shall be re-invested. The activities can include the selling of local training and coaching on the ActionTools.

#### Expenditures

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Year | Activity | Admin amount1 | Admin, % 2 | Total per year | Comment |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

*2*1Action10 contribution for co-funding of running costs. TCPP can extract 7% of each transfer from Action10 to co-fund programme running costs.  
2 Administration costs used in relation to total amount received from Action10

#### Balance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Year | Income | Expenditure | Balance | Capital kept on account | Comment |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

### Financial report summary in words

Please, comment on how and if each of the activities or issues mentioned in the table has been successfully incorporated into the programme in actual practice. Present the lesson learnt if any. Give each activity a scoring number from 1 to 5 and identify the evaluation session the observation was done. Propose an activity to follow-up on the lesson learnt, and how the follow-up has been implemented in the DESIGN document if is concerns and improvement of the strategy and/or in the Output mapping or other programme activity, if it concerns an improvement of the programme only. Also indicate an assessment of the importance of the change, score from 1 – 5.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Activity | Description the activity | Lesson learnt | Score1 | Event No | Follow up activity | Redesign action | Priority |
| Procedure efficiency | | | | |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Business plan outcome | | | | |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Income versus expenditures | | | | |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Long-term sustainability | | | | |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Supporting documents | | | | |  |  |  |

1 Scorings together with clarifying comments are compiled in the Monitoring Data sheet. Make the same structure for all Journal compilation

## Finance Markers

*The Finance Markers reflect status of the sustainable economy situation. The Finance markers must be formulated in a way that they are measurable. They are separated into single units which can be easily measured. They are developed per each of nine business model sections and are scored from one to five during the evaluation.*

Give each activity a scoring number from 1 to 5 and identify the evaluation session the observation was done. Propose an activity to follow-up on the lesson learnt, and how the follow-up has been implemented in the DESIGN document if is concerns and improvement of the strategy and/or in the Output mapping or other programme activity, if it concerns an improvement of the programme only. Also indicate an assessment of the importance of the change, score from 1 – 5. Scorings together with clarifying comments are compiled in the Monitoring Data sheet.

| Activity | Description the activity | Lesson learnt | Score1 | Event No | Follow up activity | Redesign action | Priority |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Pitch | | | | |  |  |  |
| Text | Text |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Finance markers  1.  2. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Financial vision | | | | |  |  |  |
| Text | Text |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Finance markers  1.  2. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Summary of the Business Model, the Canvas | | | | |  |  |  |
| Text | Text |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Finance markers  1.  2. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Business Model details | | | | |  |  |  |
| 4.1 Value proposition  4.2 Customer Segments  4.3 Distribution Channels  4.4 Customer Relationships  4.5 Revenue  4.6 Key Partners  4.7 Key Activities  4.8 Key Resources  4.9 Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Finance markers  1.  2. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. The team | | | | |  |  |  |
| Text | Text |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Finance markers  1.  2. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6. Risk analysis | | | | |  |  |  |
| Text | Text |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Finance markers  1.  2. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7. Implementation plan | | | | |  |  |  |
| Text | Text |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Finance markers  1.  2. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8. Cash flow budget | | | | |  |  |  |
| Text | Text |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Finance markers  1.  2. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9. Income statement budget | | | | |  |  |  |
| Text | Text |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Finance markers  1.  2. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1 Compile the scoring of the previous performance. Scorings together with clarifying comments are compiled in the Monitoring Data sheet. Make the same structure for all Journal compilations.

### More detailed information

Certain activities may benefit from a more detailed explanation than what is presented in the overall Table. Please, then address the below questions.

* Activity to be evaluated: *Text*
* Description of the Activity: *What did you do? With whom? When?*
* Effectiveness: *Text*
* Efficiency: *Text*
* Sustainability: *Text*
* Outputs: *Programme Follow-up or Changes required*
* Lessons learnt: *Text*
* Reactions: *Text*
* How well have we done? : *Text*
* How can we improve? : *Text*

## Institutional capacity journal

This journal presents the Institutional capabilities of the partner organisations to host and manage the programme. Certain aspects are jointly addressed and others are addressed per Institution.

*Institutional capacity scorings together with clarifying comments are compiled in the Monitoring Data sheet, third section.*

### IC assessment

*Please comment on different aspects of institutional capacity relevant for the program, per program partner. Each organisation is encouraged to make their own annual Institutional capacity assessment and the results can be shared between institutions for knowledge sharing. All staff shall be involved in the process for ownership development. Possible aspects are compiled below and more details can be found in the appendices. The compilation is inspired by McKinsey (2001), which proposes seven layers. Please further define indicators for each aspect.*

1. Aspirations

2. Strategy

3. Organizational skills

4. Human resources

5. Systems and infrastructure

6. Organizational structure

7. Culture

### The different sections of the institutional capacity with indicators

*Please present short each of the eight layers. The different sections of presentation as proposed here are as presented below. More details can be found in the appendices.* *The Institutional Markers reflect status of the institutional capacity situation. The Institutional markers must be formulated in a way that they are measurable. They are separated into single units which can be easily measured. They are developed per each of eight layers and are scored from one to five during the evaluation.*

| **Activity** | **Text** | **Institutional marker** | **Comment** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Aspirations |  |  |  |
| Vision |  |  |  |
| Mission |  |  |  |
| 2. Strategy |  |  |  |
| Program design and evaluation |  |  |  |
| Business plan |  |  |  |
| 3. Organizational skills |  |  |  |
| Program revisions |  |  |  |
| Fundraising |  |  |  |
| Networking |  |  |  |
| 4. Human resources |  |  |  |
| Staffing levels |  |  |  |
| Board capacity |  |  |  |
| Senior management team |  |  |  |
| 5. Systems and infrastructure |  |  |  |
| Planning |  |  |  |
| Decision making |  |  |  |
| Internal communication |  |  |  |
| 6. Organizational structure |  |  |  |
| Organisation design |  |  |  |
| 7. Culture |  |  |  |
| Beliefs and values |  |  |  |

## Ten Actions Journal

*When the program has been implemented for a period of time and has become “mature”, the capacity of the program to ensure each of the Ten Actions is measured as Action markers. This section includes a light version of the Ten Actions so please just include the most obvious aspects. A separate document can be used to captures the details, when appropriate.*

The Ten Actions (TAct). Please comment on how each of the Ten Actions is incorporated into the programme in general.

### Action Markers

*The Actions Markers reflect directly the Ten Actions. The markers address outcomes rather than outputs. The Actions markers must be formulated in a way that they are measurable. They are separated into single units which can be easily measured. They are developed per each of the Ten Actions and follow the discussion on each Action. The Action markers are scored from one to five during the evaluation.*

| No | Ten Action / Comment / Action marker | |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Describe how the program addresses the below: |
| 1 | **Needs driven program** | |
|  |  | *- was initiated and designed by the TPs and how the TPs have full ownership. - addresses the NDP.*  *- addresses the UN agreements on human rights.*  **Action markers**  **1.** |
| 2 | **Equal partnership** | |
|  |  | *- shares equally responsibilities, benefits, work load and finances.  - values equally expertise and experiences.*  *- appoints the partner best suited to address each activity*  **Action markers**  **1.** |
| 3 | **Real-time Evaluation planning** | |
|  |  | *- collects monitoring data and monitors real-time.*  *- evaluates real-time.*  *- re-designs from lessons learnt real-time and implements the changes in actual practice.*  *- produces reports real-time.*  **Action markers**  **1.** |
| 4 | **Strategic partnership** | |
|  |  | *- has developed a strategy for SPs*  *- has identified relevant SPs*  *- stays in contact with and keeps the SPs updated about program development*  *- invites Ministries to collaborate*  *- invites other relevant SPs to collaborate*  *- negotiates lower costs with relevant SPs*  **Action markers**  **1.** |
| 5 | **Institutional capacity** | |
|  |  | *- addresses vision, mission and strategy - has organizational skills - has a organizational structure*  *- addresses its Institutional culture*  *- arranges Institutional capacity assessment with board staff and volunteers*  **Action markers**  **1.** |
| 6 | **Sustainable economy** | |
|  |  | *-avoids being donor driven or dependent on grants*  *-ensures appropriate finance administration and accounting*  *-incorporates social enterprising - finds opportunities to be financed through the NDP*  **Action markers**  **1.** |
| 7 | **Quality values** | |
|  |  | *- keeps quality values high in all activities -addresses truth, trust, harmony and equity - ensured that stakeholder’s motives are international development results and nothing else*  **Action markers**  **1.** |
| 8 | **Resilience** | |
|  |  | *-ensures that despite challenges that may occur, the stakeholders find solutions, stick to the goal of the program and remain resilient, until the expected impact is achieved.*  **Action markers**  **1.** |
| 9 | **Knowledge sharing** | |
|  |  | *-develops and implement a strategy for collective knowledge sharing as knowledge sharing and that the collective knowledge is far beyond in quality than single persons or few people’s capacities*  *- has access to Internet and knowledge about social media*  **Action markers**  **1.** |
| 10 | **Visibility** | |
|  |  | *-shares quality information and with quality means*  **Action markers**  **1.** |

### Actions Markers

*The Actions Markers reflect directly the Ten Actions. The markers address outcomes rather than outputs. The Actions markers must be formulated in a way that they are measurable. They are separated into single units which can be easily measured. They are developed per each of the Ten Actions and follow the discussion on each Action.*

Give each activity a scoring number from 1 to 5 and identify the evaluation session the observation was done. Propose an activity to follow-up on the lesson learnt, and how the follow-up has been implemented in the DESIGN document if is concerns and improvement of the strategy and/or in the Output mapping or other programme activity, if it concerns an improvement of the programme only. Also indicate an assessment of the importance of the change, score from 1 – 5. Scorings together with clarifying comments are compiled in the Monitoring Data sheet.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Activity | Description the activity | Lesson learnt | Score1 | Event No | Follow up activity | Redesign action | Priority |
| 1. Needs driven programme | | | | |  |  |  |
| Text | Text |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Action markers  1.  2. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Equal partnership | | | | |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Action markers  1.  2. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Real-time evaluation planning | | | | |  |  |  |
| On-site monitoring |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Action markers  1.  2. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Strategic partnership | | | | |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Action markers  1.  2. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. Institutional capacity | | | | |  |  |  |
| Administration cost | *Action10 transfers 97% of funds raised for this programme directly to the TCPP. Admin costs in Sweden are covered by the by the remaining 3%.* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | *The TCPP distributes 93% of funds transferred for this programme to the Target partners. Operating costs in TC are co-financed by the by the remaining 7%.* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Management |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Staff and volunteers | *Staff and volunteers allocated for each task in the activity plan, training and experience* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Physical infrastructure | *Physical infrastructure available to support each activity in the Activity plan, including office space, computers, internet and transportation* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Action markers  1.  2. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6. Sustainable economy | | | | |  |  |  |
| Balance  income / cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Action markers  1.  2. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Action markers  1.  2. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7. Quality values | | | | |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Action markers  1.  2. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8. Resilience | | | | |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Action markers  1.  2. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9. Knowledge sharing | | | | |  |  |  |
| Training of staff and volunteers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Action markers  1.  2. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10. Visibility | | | | |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1 Compile the scoring of the previous performance. Scorings together with clarifying comments are compiled in the Monitoring Data sheet. Make the same structure for all Journal compilations.

### More detailed information

Certain activities may benefit from a more detailed explanation than what is presented in the overall Table. Please, then address the below questions.

* Capacity to be evaluated: *Text*
* Description of Capacity: *What did you do? With whom? When?*
* Effectiveness: *Text*
* Efficiency: *Text*
* Sustainability: *Text*
* Outputs: *Programme Follow-up or Changes required*
* Lessons learnt: *Text*
* Reactions: *Text*
* How well have we done? : *Text*
* How can we improve? : *Text*

# Appendices

## Appendix 1 Monitoring data collection

Data can be collected in a variety of ways. The ActionTools is primarily working according to the below methods.

### Data collection on-site and EP meetings

The PPs are continuously collecting data as they work on-site with the TPs. They carry a sheet of the Progress markers and add to the sheet scores and comments related to the scores. This is a crucial work and requires persons being appointed for the task to also be provided with the documents, with necessary resources and with training and coached on the method.

The TCPP Office adds the other scores in the MONITORING DATA Excel sheet real-time.

Once a year or more often the PPs meet to do Outcome and Impact ASSESSMENT and Assessment follow-ups. The follow-ups include programme design revisions and the development and distribution of Programme Reports.

### Separate surveys

Under certain conditions surveys are carried out. The tools used as Monkey survey, paper questionnaires, Excel sheets with Pivot tables.

### Database

For large programmes databases are constructed.

## Appendix 2 Scoring method

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ****Score**** | ****In words**** | ****In percent (%)**** | ****Comment**** |
| **5** | **Excellent** | **90 – 100** |  |
| **4** | **Good** | **70 – 90** |  |
| **3** | **Adequate** | 30 – 70 |  |
| **2** | **Poor** | **10 – 30** |  |
| **1** | **No performance** | 0 – 10 |  |

Please note

* The sign \* behind a scoring signifies that the outcome was achieved as a result of the outputs of other actors than the PPs
* If the number of Target partners is increasing with time they should be grouped; Group one may for example include the 300 TPs entered the programme during a period of two years. If the number of individuals in Target partner group increases with time then the scoring of each group is indicated in the scoring box, separated by commas.
* Scoring based on percentage supersedes scoring based on words. Thus, when a progress marker can be assessed with a percentage, then this is what the scoring shall be based on.
* The scoring can be developed at three levels; per individual, per group of individual and per programme.

### What each scoring number represents

The meaning of each scoring number has been borrowed from the Rubrics method ([Davidson 2011](#_ENREF_1))

* **Excellent (5):** The performance is clearly very strong or exemplary in relation to the progress marker statement. Any gaps or weaknesses are not significant and are managed effectively.
* **Good (4):** Performance is generally strong in relation to the statement. No significant gaps or weaknesses, and less significant gaps or weaknesses are mostly managed effectively.
* **Adequate (3):** Performance is inconsistent in relation to the statement. Some gaps or weaknesses. Meets minimum expectations/ requirements as far as can be determined.
* **Poor (2):** Performance is unacceptably weak in relation to the statement. It does not meet the minimum expectations or requirements.
* **No performance/ insufficient (1): There is no performance at all or the** evidence is unavailable to determine performance.

When performing the scoring e.g., what evidence led the evaluators to assess the performance as “generally strong”(good) – as opposed to “clearly very strong or exemplary” (excellent) or “inconsistent” (adequate) ([Davidson 2011](#_ENREF_1)). The evaluation can preferably **include the most important examples of both positive and negative evidence**. Similarly, what were the gaps or weaknesses, and why for example should they be considered “not significant” (good)?, based on what? As for “less significant gaps or weaknesses are mostly managed effectively” (good), what, specifically, is the stakeholder doing to manage gaps and weaknesses, and why do the evaluators consider this “effective management” in most or all instances?

### The issue of subjectivity

The scoring obviously intends to avoid “subjectivity”. Davidson ([2011](#_ENREF_1)) claims there are the three kinds of ‘subjectivity’.

1. Arbitrary, idiosyncratic, unreliable, and/or highly personal (i.e., based on personal preferences and/or cultural biases)
2. Assessment or interpretation by a person, rather than a machine or measurement device, of something external to that person (e.g., expert judgment of others’ skills or performance)
3. About a person’s inner life or experiences (e.g., headaches, fears, beliefs, emotions, stress levels, aspirations), all absolutely real but not usually independently verifiable Plus the red herring: subjective vs. objective measures.

## Appendix 3 Evaluation planning journals

The evaluation planning journals include the Outcome, the Output mapping, the Sustainable economy and the Institutional capacity journals.

### Outcome journal

*The Outcome journal monitors the progress of each Target partner towards the achievement of outcomes.* *Progress markers scorings together with clarifying comments are compiled in the Monitoring Data sheet, first section, if large in volume. If not so large in volume then the progress markers are compiled in the below table.*

Progress markers selected for the monitoring: As presented in the DESIGN document.

Scoring method: Action10 scoring method

Complementary scoring method besides ActionTool: *Text*

Notes: *Text*

#### Method

1. Scoring of Progress markers
   1. Compile the progress markers in the Monitoring Data Sheet, first section (excel),  
       or if the volume is small enough, in the below table (word).
   2. Give each Progress marker a running number
   3. Compile the scoring of each progress marker
   4. Compile short comments adding information to scorings when appropriate
2. Registering outcomes
   1. Compile achieved outcomes
      1. What evidence demonstrates this change in terms of outcome?
   2. Compile not achieve outcomes
      1. Which revision seems necessary to achieve the outcomes?
   3. Compile unanticipated outcomes if any
3. Compile Descriptions of Change
   1. Identifying the progress marker´s number(s) it refers to
   2. Compile contributing factors and actors as well as sources of evidence
4. Compile lessons and reactions
5. Identify the appropriate programme design changes

To track progress over time, an outcome journal is established for each Target Partner that the programme has identified as a priority. The Outcome journal used is a modified version of the Outcome Mapping tool developed by [Earl, Carden et al. (2001)](#_ENREF_2).

Direct learning from the monitoring exercises should be fed into the programme design revisions.

#### Base line

The monitoring starts at the same time as the design of the programme. The first task is to identify the baseline of the programme; the presentation of the situation prior to the start of the programme. Progress marker and Ten Action scorings together with the related comments are compiled in the Monitoring data sheet.

#### Progress markers

The progress markers are graduated, and some of them, particularly those listed under “level 2 and 3”, describe a complex behaviour that is difficult to categorize as “having occurred” or “not having occurred.” Although many of the progress markers could be the subject of an in-depth evaluation themselves, this is not their intended purpose ([Earl, Carden et al. 2001](#_ENREF_2)). The progress markers are not developed as a lockstep description of how the change process must occur; rather, they describe the major milestones that would indicate progress towards the achievement of the outcome challenge. The purpose of the progress markers in monitoring is to systematize the collection of data on the Target Partners’ accomplishments. These details should be viewed as the richness of the results, not as check-marks to be obtained.

The Progress markers articulate the results that the programme has helped to achieve ([Earl, Carden et al. 2001](#_ENREF_2)). They do so by tracking and discussing trends in the behaviours of the Target Partners. Although there is not a cause-and-effect relationship between the programme’s actions and changes in the Target Partner, by compiling information using the outcome journal, the programme will better understand how its actions do, or do not, influence its Target Partners. With this information, the programme will be able to improve its own performance and encourage its Target Partners to achieve deeper levels of transformation. The programme will also be creating records of observed changes. These records can periodically be synthesized to tell the story of influence and change relative to areas of interest or achievement.

The purpose with the Action Evaluation planning Tool is to avoid focusing on outputs until these have been identified by the Target partners. The dream, the mission, the Outcome challenges and Progress markers all address the wish of the Target partners to be able to do certain things to improve their livelihood or operations. Only in the Output mapping do outputs appear.

#### Theory of Change

Theory of Change (ToC) is a specific type of methodology for planning, participation, and evaluation that is used in the philanthropy, not-for-profit and government sectors to promote social change[[2]](#footnote-2). Theory of Change defines long-term goals and then maps backward to identify necessary preconditions. The innovation of Theory of Change lies (1) in making the distinction between desired and actual outcomes, and (2) in requiring stakeholders to model their desired outcomes before they decide on forms of intervention to achieve those outcomes. Theory of Change is a form of critical theory that ensures a transparent distribution of power dynamics. Further, the process is necessarily inclusive of many perspectives and participants in achieving solutions.

### Output mapping journal

The Strategy of Action10 is based on the premises that the programme has to be prepared to change along with its Target partners. The Output mapping will need to continuously be revised in order to respond to its Target Partners’ changing needs. In order to provide the programme with a systematic way to monitor its activities, so that it can think strategically about its contributions and modify its activities as required the Output mapping is assessed real-time.

The Output mapping journal records data on the strategy being employed to provide the means necessary for the Target partners to reach their Dreams. It is filled out during the programme’s regular Evaluation planning meetings. Although it can be customized to include specific elements that the programme wants to monitor, the generic format includes the resources allocated (inputs), the activities undertaken, the outputs, and any required follow-up.

### Sustainable economy journal

The Finance Markers reflect status of the sustainable economy situation. The Finance markers are developed per each of nine business model sections and are scored from one to five during the evaluation.

### Institutional capacity journal

The journal records data on how the institution managing the programme is operating fulfil the mission of the programme. The Institutional capacity assessment concerns the section of the Institution managing the addressed programme.

The institutional journal as a whole includes a variety of components and the Programme needs to make prioritisations. The Programme may choose only a few parameters at the start of the Programme with the aim of increasing the number of parameters with time. Institutional capacity scoring is done annually with all staff and volunteers attending a one – five day meeting. Below is compiled a selection of parameters, whereas a more elaborated compilation of parameters is available as one of the ActionTools.

#### Ten Actions

All PPs ensure that the Ten Actions are addressed fully in all procedures and all programmes

#### Evaluation planning

The revisions in any of the Programme Parameters are recorded together with dates and the decision makers.

#### Knowledge sharing

All PPs shall manage social media such as website and facebook.

#### Finance administration and accounting

Action10 has developed guidelines presenting international standards. All Programme Partners have agreed to follow the international standards. PPs can provide training and coaching. All PPs ensure full transparency in all procedures and all programmes

#### Programme revisions

The level of the incorporation of results from Impact assessment sessions into revised programmes is monitored.

#### Staff

Each PP has to have at least one “programme manager” who is responsible for the activities on site as well as the real-time monitoring and evaluation planning. Each PP must also have a financial manager who is responsible for the finance administration and accounting as well as the agreements between the PPs.

Develop and maintain policy for; Keeping staff and volunteers trained, motivated, aware of tasks, responsibilities and obligations.

#### Countering conflicts

Each PP may develop, update and implement when appropriate a conflict resolution strategy.

## Appendix 4 Institutional capacity assessment

McKinsey (2001) proposes seven layers to describe the institutional capacity. McKinsey excluded the financial aspect, why, for Action10 and HR&S the previous section on sustainable economy shall be added to the seven layers to fully describe institutional capacity.

1. Aspirations
2. Strategy
3. Organizational skills
4. Human resources
5. Systems and infrastructure
6. Organizational structure
7. Culture

### 1. Aspirations

* Vision
* Mission

### 2. Strategy

* Program
  + Identify program topics
* Staff capacity / volunteers
  + Outcome challenges for staff and volunteers
  + Progress markers
  + Output map
* Business plan
  + Identify the customers and their needs
  + Marketing
  + Income / expenses

### 3. Organizational skills

* Performance management
  + Performance measurement
  + Performance analysis and program adjustments
* Planning
  + Monitoring of landscape
  + Strategic planning
  + Financial planning/budgeting
  + Operational planning
  + Human resources planning
* Fund-raising and revenue generation
  + Fund-raising
  + Revenue generation
* External relationship building and management
  + Partnership and alliances development and nurturing
  + Local community presence and involvement
* Other organizational skills
  + Public relations and marketing
  + Influencing of policy-making
  + Management of legal and liability matters
  + Organizational processes use and development

### 4. Human resources

* Staffing levels
* Board – composition and commitment
* Board – involvement and support
* CEO/executive director and/or senior management team
  + Passion and vision
  + Impact orientation
  + People and organizational leadership/effectiveness
  + Personal and interpersonal effectiveness
  + Analytical and strategic thinking
  + Financial judgment
  + Experience and standing
* Management team and staff – dependence on CEO/executive director
* Senior management team (if not previously covered)
* Staff
* Volunteers

### 5. Systems and infrastructure

* Systems
  + Planning systems
  + Decision making framework
  + Financial operations management
  + Human resources management – management recruiting, development, and retention
  + Human resources management – general staff recruiting, development, and retention
  + Human resources management – incentives
  + Knowledge management
  + Internal communication
* Infrastructure
  + Physical infrastructure – buildings and office space
  + Technological infrastructure – telephone/fax
  + Technological infrastructure – computers, applications, network, and e-mail
  + Technological infrastructure – Web site
  + Technological infrastructure – databases and management reporting systems

### 6. Organizational structure

* Board governance
* Organizational design
* Interfunctional coordination
* Individual job design

### 7. Culture

* Performance as shared value
* Other shared beliefs and values, such as the Ten Actions
* Shared references and practices

## Appendix 5 The Ten Actions (TAct)

The Ten Actions was developed by Assoc. Professor Cecilia ÖMAN in 2009. The strategy has been implemented in actual practice since 2009 and based on the lessons learnt the strategy is continuously being revised and improved. The strategy is managed by Human Rights and Science (HR&S) [www.HR&S.se](http://www.RandS.se) and is also implemented by Action10 [www.Action10.org](http://www.Action10.org)[[3]](#footnote-3). More information on Tact can be requested for through the HR&S website and a financial contribution is appreciated. Trainings and seminars on the tool can also be requested for through the HR&S website.

**The Ten Actions are:**

**1. Needs driven program**

**2. Equal partnership**

**3. Outcome based Real-time Planning and Evaluation (ROPE)**

**4. Strategic partnership**

**5. Institutional capacity**

**6. Sustainable economy**

**7. Quality values**

**8. Resilience**

**9. Knowledge sharing**

**10. Visibility**

### 1. Needs driven program

**Needs driven program is here defined as a set of activities identified, designed and managed by the Target Partners.**

### 2. Equal partnership

**Equal partnership is here defined as a fully equal relation between all Program partners. Program partners share all responsibilities and benefits equally including design, implementation, evaluation, reporting and benefits equally. The partnership is also equal with the Target Partners.**

### 3. Real time evaluation planning

**Real time evaluation planning is here defined as capturing lessons learnt as soon as they have been generated and immediately adopt and thus improve the program design. In order to address the evaluation planning in the Ten Actions a tool has been developed called the Program Journal (PJ). The Program journal is crucial for all Action10 and HR&S programs as it also ensures that the Ten Actions are fully addressed.**

### 4. Strategic partnership

**Strategic partnership concerns staying informed about the programs and activities of institutions with related mandates as well as sharing knowledge with the same. Collaboration must always be proposed as soon as it seems appropriate. All types of institutions are addressed, national as well as international, and include; governments, authorities, academia, private sector, civil society organisations, aid organisations and media.**

### 5. Institutional capacity

**The institutional capacity concerns all aspects of the capacity of the Program partner institutions to manage the program including; governance, policies, strategies, staff number and competences, finances, finance administration and accounting procedures, administration, and infrastructure.**

### 6. Sustainable economy

**Each of the Action10 and HR&S programs must have a sustainable economy. It may need seed funding or investment capital to get started but shall never depend on external funding. A source of income must be identified that will pay back the investment with interest, often 10 % per year. The concept is based on the value platform Needs Driven Program (Ten Actions No 1). If the program is actually needs driven then the Target partner will be willing to pay for products and services delivered, thus the program will eventually have a sustainable economy. Thus the Target partner is also considered to be a customer. Consequently, a sustainable economy according to the Action10 and HR&S concept does not only ensure the long term impact of a program but also the needs driven aspect. Attention obviously must be made to the customer’s capacity to pay.**

### 7. Quality values

**The quality values of the Action10 and HR&S programs include truth, trust, equity and harmony. Any relation, partnership, communication, transaction, activity and report must fully honour the four Action10 and HR&S quality values.**

### 8. Resilience

**With resilience is interpreted the capacity to stay strong, even when challenges threatens the program. A weakness in an activity or in a behaviour that threatens the program; for example due to political reasons in the Target country, lack of resources or weak implementation of the Ten Actions, is managed by the partners together who will show patience, respect, capacity, care and love.**

### 9. Knowledge sharing

**The here used definition for knowledge sharing is mutual, timely and honest sharing of knowledge for the benefit of all partners, PPs, TPs and SP as well as for the general public. All means available shall be used for the purpose including; face-to-face meetings, seminars, workshops, media, social media, and scientific publishing.**

### 10. Visibility

**World-wide extreme poverty eradication requires a world-wide program and network of actors, thus visibility is core for Action10/HR&S’ mission to reach its vision. All means available shall be used for the purpose including participation is events arranged by Strategic partners, seminars, workshops, social media, media, institutional annual reports and scientific publishing.**

## Appendix 6 Definitions

The ActionTool Evaluation planning addresses a logical relationship between the inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes and impact of a programme. The purpose is ( as with any logical model) to assess the causal relationships between the elements of the programme; if the resources are available for a programme, then the activities can be implemented, if the activities are implemented successfully then outputs are provided and certain and outcomes can be expected short term and an impact can be expected long-term.

The ActionTool Evaluation planning uses the below definitions:

**Inputs**: The resources that are invested in a programme, e.g. money, staff and equipment.

**Activities**: The activities the programme undertakes, e.g. development and distribution of materials, awareness raising sessions, training programmes or coaching.

**Outputs**: What is produced through those activities, e.g. number of booklets produced, workshops held, people trained.

**Outcomes**: The changes or benefits that result from the programme, e.g. increased skills, knowledge, awareness, confidence and motivation; leading to e.g. higher ration of school attendance and exams passed, new business establishments, employments and promotions.

**Impacts**: Structural changes that result from the programme at the local, regional or national level, e.g. practices, decisions and policies with social, economic, environmental implications, e.g. local authorities ensures that all children go to school and that all schools provide quality education or facilitates the establishment of new businesses.

## Appendix 7 Assessment in theory

The assessment shall help us to improve the programme where weaknesses as well as identify what we did well and ensure to keep this.

The purpose of both monitoring and evaluation is to base management and programming decisions on systematically collected data. Using monitoring journals, the programme can gather information that is broad in coverage rather than deep in detail. By conducting an evaluation, the programme can choose a strategy, issue, or relationship to study and assess in depth.

There will never be sufficient time and resources for a programme to evaluate everything, therefore priorities should be set and choices made. Regardless of the evaluation issue selected, however, the programme first needs to devise an evaluation plan carefully so that resources are allocated wisely and the evaluation findings are useful. The programme needs to be clear about the identification of clients for the in-depth evaluation and ensure their participation in the process. The Impact assessment stage offers a process by which a programme can do this. The programme will not necessary complete the evaluation plan during the Assessment meetings; it can be developed at any point, whenever the programme is preparing to begin an evaluation process.

The assessment plan provides a short description of the main elements of the evaluation to be conducted by the programme. It outlines the evaluation issue, the way findings will be used, the questions, the information sources, the assessment methods, the assessment team, the dates for the assessment, and the approximate cost. The information in the assessment plan will guide the evaluation design and, if the programme has decided to use an external evaluator, it can be used to set the terms of reference for the contract. Discussing the various elements of the assessment plan will help the programme to plan an assessment that will provide useful findings. Whether the assessment is a formal requirement or not, the programme should ensure that it is relevant to its needs, in order not to waste human and financial resources.

The programme needs to plan for utilisation, because utilisation does not necessarily follow naturally from the results.

The assessment is the most straightforward element of a programme, and the politics of getting findings used is a key challenge in a programme. The information needs of the Primary user of the assessment findings are paramount. The primary user must attend the session when the group is developing the evaluation plan. Getting the Primary user involved in the evaluation process from the planning phase will focus data collection activities on the critical issues and prevent the waste of human and financial resources. Regular involvement of the Primary throughout the phases of data collection and analysis will test the validity of the findings and increase the likelihood of their utilisation. Utilisation is the ultimate purpose of the impact assessment, therefore this “front-end” work should be given due attention, whether the programme is conducting a self-assessment or responding to external pressure.

The Primary user of ActionTool Programme assessments is most often the local, regional and/or national authorities.

## Appendix 8 Real-time assessment in actual practice

It is important to review the logic of the programme periodically to ensure that it remains relevant. Based on practical experience, the programme looks at whether new Target Partners have been added; whether others have been dropped; and whether the vision, mission, outcome challenges, and progress markers still make sense. If for example the progress markers are no longer appropriate indicators of change, then they should be revised to reflect the new conditions. In this way, the programme will be gathering information on the changing context, and will have information about unexpected results in the Target Partner. The changes in programme logic can then be made to the documentation. Strategic partners can well contribute to this review.

#### Frequency

Face to face or well prepared multi stakeholder Skype meetings are arranged at least once a year, but preferably twice a year or more.

Direct communication is arranged at least once a month using Skype, telephone or e-mails.

## Appendix 9 External evaluation

Evaluation Issue

Date (start & finish)

Who will use the evaluation? How? When?

Questions

Information sources

Evaluation methods

Who will conduct and manage the evaluation?

Cost
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