Part 4 Programme design and indicators

I Introduction

Many books and guidelines have been written on (participatory) problem analysis, programme design, planning, monitoring and evaluation, learning from experience, etc. Hivos has no intention to replicate those - more expert - authors and urges its partners to search for the theoretical and practical support that suits them best in their situation. Some entry points for this search can be found in Part 5 Annexes and references.
However, in the field of PM&E, result assessment, strategic planning, result-based management, etc., experts do not agree on the exact meaning of terms. Definitions and explanations differ, sometimes slightly, sometimes considerably. Hivos does not expect that it will be possible to come to a complete synchronisation and joint use of terminology with its more than 800 partners. We all know workshops where half of the available time was used to discuss (and sometimes fight over) the exact or correct meaning of terms. As achieving consensus is probably an illusion, trying to do so can be considered a waste of time.
Notwithstanding, Hivos and its partners are negotiating contracts and in order to start off on the same foot, it is important that we create some basic clarity on what we mean and expect if we use certain terms in our communication. This part of the paper will outline some issues related to programme design and the selection of indicators, in order to support partners who feel that they need some guidance and in order to clarify Hivos' view on the proposed result assessment procedures. This does not imply that partners are obliged to use the exact terms Hivos uses, as long as we have enough common ground to understand each other when we speak of 'results'.
The information and examples provided in this part of the paper are far from exhaustive and may be contested by other visions.

II Programme design and theory of change

Whether or not we use the Logframe as a planning instrument, the concept of a 'results chain' in which activities lead to concrete results (*output*) that are used by and have effects on people (*effect/ outcome*) in a way that is expected to contribute to more structural changes in the longer term (*impact*), is a useful model for result-oriented thinking.
Change processes in general do not follow a linear, cause-effect model, because they are influenced by many different external (f)actors. But concrete interventions within development processes are often based on assumptions of causality: "If A ..., than (probably) B will happen". Every development organisation makes assumptions with regard to how change can be brought about in its particular society or context. These assumptions are not always conscious and made explicit, but are an

important underlying factor in how the organisation chooses, formulates and operationalises its objectives, strategies and activities.

Our assumptions are related to our analysis of problems of poverty and inequality and are influenced by our vision, ideology, culture, education, etc. They point to the social, behavioural and/or economic mechanisms we believe are at work in causing and solving the problem. They come from experience of the organisation (and of individuals within it) with social change, and from what we believe is true. The assumptions of an organisation with regard to change and how it translates them in intervention strategies and programmes, is called the 'theory of change' – or 'intervention logic', 'programme theory', 'programme logic' or 'policy theory' - of an organisation or a programme. At an organisational level, the theory of change of the organisation is often reflected in its vision and mission and in its main goals and strategies.

It is important for an organisation to make its theory of change or intervention logic explicit, to "unpack assumptions", because it helps to sharpen the formulation of objectives, to choose strategies in a realistic and consistent way and to identify indicators that are relevant for the intended change.

Some questions to help "unpack assumptions":

- Why do you think that intervention X will lead to result Y?
- Is that assumption supported by experience of the organisation, other organisations, or by other sources of knowledge?
- Is what you actually do (and the way you do it) consistent with your vision on how change happens?
- Are your assumptions still relevant and pertinent, or has the context or the field of forces changed over time?

Programme design

With the increased focus on results and how to 'measure' them, we risk to forget that assessing results is the last part of a cycle. But we cannot start at the end of the process: which results we want to achieve should be central to the programme design from the beginning. What do you want to achieve, for whom, in what way and which role can your organisation realistically play in the achievement of that goal?

To formulate a clear intervention logic for the programmes of the organisation, long(er) term goals need to be broken down in intermediate steps to take, or stages to be reached first. These may be conditional for reaching a higher level goal and may represent an intermediate short- or mid-term objective for the programme. Making this analysis helps to formulate intermediary results on a short(er) term, for which indicators can be identified that are easier to 'measure' than the longer-term result and that can indicate if you are on the right track.

The gap between the concrete activities of one organisation and the achievement of a long-term development goal is often enormous. Breaking down long-term goals in mid- and short-term objectives is necessary to bridge the gap with the goal at impact level and to be able to plan for the mid-term, to monitor the process and assess if you are on the right track.

Working towards longer-term goals of an organisation or programme can be seen as a sequence of results chains: results achieved in an earlier phase are the starting point for formulation of new objectives and activities, in order to arrive at results in a next stage, closer to the envisaged mid-term and long-term goals.

Sometimes this process of analysis and planning is visualised as a road to travel: what will be the path you will follow towards your goal? Maybe there is more than one path you can take to arrive at the final destination? What will be your stops or milestones along the way? Who will be your co-travellers, and helpers along the road? Are there any obstacles or ambushes to be expected? Which signs or changes along the road will indicate (!) that you are on the right track? What about cross-roads, detours, short-cuts ...?

The intervention or programme logic is not a static picture, drawn up once and never reviewed: what is considered the 'best' way to reach the goal will change over time, as a consequence of changes in the context, actions of other actors, new information or knowledge, and - last but not least - experience of the organisation with activities and strategies that do or do not succeed.

Results (products) vs. process

During the partner consultations, a frequently expressed concern was that by too much focus on 'results', the 'process' leading to the results would not be counted in. Many participants felt, that in development the process itself and the value and quality of that process is a critical element, even when the 'final' results are not (yet) measurable or tangible. Linked to that issue, the question of 'process indicators' versus 'result indicators' came up.

Hivos agrees that the process of social change and empowerment that partners and their constituencies are involved in, are part and parcel of development itself, even when in the end – for many reasons – the goals may not always be achieved. But to underscore a dichotomy between results and process does not seem to be very productive. Maybe it is a question of terminology: when results are only acknowledged as results if they are tangible and measurable 'products' or services, the positive effects of the 'process' might be neglected. Sometimes, these type of results are considered side-effects or spin-offs. But in Hivos' view, non-tangible, more qualitative outcomes of development processes should be viewed as 'products' or results in their own right. The very challenge we face is to identify and give words to those type of results and find indicators and methods to monitor them.

However, Hivos is not in favour of using the term 'process indicator', because in the literature it has many different meanings. What's more, it gives the impression that these indicators don't indicate 'results', while in Hivos' view they are outcomes of deliberate interventions as well.

> For example: an inclusive and participatory approach, a strong gender perspective, and capacity building elements are often considered as qualitative aspects of the intervention process, leading to growing feelings of self-esteem and ownership and increased leadership and agency of poor women and men. Both this quality of the process and any observable effects on the people participating in it are results in their own right and can be monitored and assessed.

Terminology

As mentioned in Part 3, Hivos uses the DAC Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management (ref. Part 5: Annexes) as the basis for the terminology in its policies and communication around result orientation and result assessment.

It is important that Hivos and partners have the same understanding of the levels of results that the mutual agreement in the contract refers to:

- outputs: direct results (products, services) from activities related to short-term objectives;
- outcomes or effects[1]: results in terms of the direct or indirect effects of the outputs, related to mid-term or intermediate objectives;
- impact: structural (lasting, significant) change, related to longer-term development objectives or goals.

For all type of results goes that they can be positive or negative, and intended or unintended.

III Selection of indicators

3.1 What is an indicator?

> *Who has seen the wind?*
> *Neither you nor I.*
> *But where the trees bow down their heads,*
> *The wind is passing by.*
>
> *(The Wind, Christina Rosetti, 1830-1894)*

In the discussion on result assessment, a lot of attention is being paid to the use of indicators.

[1] Please, note that the terms "outcome" and "effect" are often used interchangeably for this level of results. As the term "outcome" is also used for results in general, Hivos prefers to use the term "effect".

Sometimes, it seems that if we could just find the right indicators, all our result assessment problems would be solved. Some people put all their hope in that ... and others speak of it as a disease: "indicatoritis".
Indicators should not be looked upon in isolation: the identification and selection of relevant indicators is part of the design process. However, if we want to track changes in complex social and economic processes, we need to follow and analyse these processes step-by-step, in order to know if any change is happening. To be able to do so, we need to identify relevant 'signs of change'. An indicator is basically a sign of change.

Definitions of "indicator"

1. DAC Glossary: "Indicator: a quantitative or qualitative factor or variable that provides a simple and reliable means to measure achievement, to reflect the changes connected to an intervention, or to help assess the performance of a development actor."

2. Bakewell e.a.: 'Sharpening the development process' (INTRAC, 2003):
   "An indicator is an observable change or event which provides evidence that something has happened as a result of the (project) intervention – whether an output delivered, immediate effect occurred or long term change observed. [..] An indicator does not provide proof so much as a reliable sign that the event or process being claimed has actually happened (or is happening). The evidence from a number of indicators will provide the convincing case for the claims being made."

3. The European Commission describes (planning) indicators as: "A description of the project's objectives in terms of quantity, quality, target group(s), time and place".
   In this vision, the indicator is considered and used as *a specification of the objective*.
   - Quality (variable): the element to be measured (what?)
   - Quantity: actual situation and situation to be reached (how much?)
   - Target group: the people affected by the project (who?)
   - Time: in which period/ at what time should the target been reached (when?).
   - Place: location concerned (where?)

Guideline:
When asking for indicators, Hivos expects her partners to identify in the first place the *variable* (ref. the first two definitions), meaning the element, factor or phenomenon that reflects a change that can be observed or measured.
This doesn't mean that it is not necessary to specify the objectives further, in terms of the target or expected result(s), the intended target group or beneficiaries, and the period in which the result is expected to be achieved. Hivos expects those specifications in the funding proposal or the Work plan. They need not necessarily be part of the indicator itself. But if another donor demands the indicators to be formulated in the way of the European Commission (definition 3), this is no problem for Hivos: they can be submitted to Hivos in that way too.

Some more remarks about indicators

- The word 'indicator' doesn't mean anything in itself, it has no content (yet). An indicator 'indicates' a change in a situation, it is a sign that something has changed. That 'something' has to be specified and is always related to a specific target, result or process.

- What an indicator tells us depends on who we are and what we want to know.
  For example: bowing treetops as an indicator for "wind" may be good news to the sailor, but bad news to the fire brigade trying to extinguish a forest fire.

- Indicators only indicate, they don't explain anything: determining that change has occurred does not tell us why it has occurred. Indicators constitute only part of the analysis needed to give meaning to change and to explain either success or failure. The human factor in interpreting data or results remains crucial. And again: if the perceived change is considered positive or negative depends largely on the situation, needs and interests of the people involved in the analysis.

3.2 Types and characteristics of indicators

There is no "one fits all" recipe for choosing indicators. It depends on the type of objectives, the type of intervention and activities, the level of intervention and the timeframe of the activities. For example: a women's organisation lobbying at national level for legal change in family law and better reproductive health services needs other indicators to track their results than a community-based organisation mobilising people to articulate their priorities to local authorities.

Although we should not re-invent the wheel and should make good use of the work others have already done by identifying indicators for all kinds of (sectoral) policies and activities, the use of standardised checklist of indicators is widely advised against. Why?
Because:

- each situation demands a context specific analysis: what can be a good indicator in one situation, may mean nothing in another;
- intended beneficiaries and/or other stakeholders need to be involved in the identification of indicators: what is their perception of the intended result? Which indicators are significant for them?

> Please, keep in mind that different stakeholders may take contrasting views on the nature of the desired results - and choose different indicators. Gender, class and age differences, to name but a few, may heavily influence the perception of what are good indicators for e.g. well-being in terms of income, housing or health.

3.2.1 Quantitative and qualitative indicators

The major divide in research approaches is sometimes presented as between quantitative and qualitative research. The first is seen as concerned with numbers and the second more with meanings. A quantitative approach asks *how many* people share a particular characteristic, or hold a particular view. A qualitative one looks more at *what* people think and feel, and *why*.
A qualitative approach describes the nature of answers (evidence) in terms of their written or other descriptive nature. It asks who, which, what, when, where, and why – in contrast to 'quantitative' answers addressing how much, how many, to what extent. Most research for practical purposes contains some elements of both.[2]

Quantitative indicators are used for results that can be 'counted' and expressed in numbers, figures, percentages, scores, scales, etc. They are mostly physical, tangible, material results, that can be measured in a quantitative way.
Examples: increased crop production, decreased incidence of sexually transmitted diseases, 30% women in parliament.

Qualitative indicators are expressed in a narrative way and are often used for less tangible, more immaterial results, e.g.:

- changes in awareness or behaviour of people (or institutions);
- people's perception of changes in their lives, community or society;
- people's appreciation of activities or results.

Qualitative information may be obtained in personal contacts (interviews, focus groups), by observation, or from analysis of other data. For example: analysing minutes of group meetings may offer qualitative data about (the changes in) the level and quality of participation of women and men in discussion and decision-making.

Often indicators can be identified for both the quantity and quality of results, e.g.:

- the number of training sessions and participants, and the appreciation of the participants;
- the number of people (M/F, specific target group) attending a meeting, and the quality of their participation;
- the passing of a specific law and the degree to which the issues of the lobby have been incorporated.

The combination of quantitative and qualitative indicators in general offers a balanced view on results achieved.

[2] Sophie Laws e.a. – Research for Development.

NB Qualitative data can often be expressed in a quantitative way too, in the form of percentages or by using scores or scales: e.g. 75% of the participants of a training is satisfied with its quality, 35% of the women over 50 in village X judges the quality of her life as higher than that of her mother. This can be helpful for the aggregation and analysis of large amounts of data.

3.2.2 Direct and indirect indicators

Direct indicators
A direct indicator is a measure which refers *directly* to the activity or objective in question.
For example: indicators for increased access to services: the number and categories of people using them.

Indirect or proxy indicators
A proxy indicator is a variable used to stand in for one that is difficult to measure directly.
For less tangible results often proxy indicators for change or progress can be identified: f.e. increased use of condoms is an accepted indicator for increased awareness on Aids and change in behaviour.

A well-known example of a proxy for household income: instead of trying to collect accurate information on household or individual incomes which is notoriously difficult, the number of households with a tin roof, owning a bicycle or plough might be used to indicate changes in household or community wealth.
It is important not to confuse direct and proxy indicators: the effort may be diverted into achieving *change in the indicator* - whether this is appropriate to the objective or not – for example by supplying tin roofs as a means to address income poverty.

3.2.3 Selection criteria for indicators

In the literature on monitoring and evaluation one can find a variety of quality criteria for indicators.

Commonly used criteria are:

- *Valid and Specific*
  This refers to the causal relation between what you want to know and what you measure, and the indicator should be clearly related to areas in which the intervention is expected to make some difference, avoiding measures that are largely subject to external influences.

- *Unambiguous*
  The indicator should be clearly defined, so that measurement and interpretation is unambiguous. For example: in "(improved) access to ... services", the notion "access" has different aspects (such as physical, financial, geographical, gender, class or cultural barriers): what will be monitored/ measured?

- *Credible*
  There must be a reasonable case for the view that changes in the selected indicators are related, directly or indirectly, to the intervention.

- *Consistent*
  Ideally, the same indicators should be measured over a long period, in order to track long-term processes. However: if an indicator is not relevant anymore, if the context, priorities or objectives have changed, or there are important unexpected effects, it might be necessary to revise or replace the indicator.

- *Sensitive*
  Means that there is a short reaction time to change: the quicker results lead to change in the indicator, the more useful it is for monitoring. For example: the outcome of elections that are held once every 5 years is not a very sensitive indicator for changes in the political force field.

- *Easy to collect*
  An important selection criterion for indicators is if it is feasible to collect information on the

indicators within a reasonable time and at a reasonable cost. Monitoring of information that is too difficult, time-consuming or costly to collect, will in practice quickly be dropped (ref. also 2.2.4).

Another set of properties of indicators (ref. Box) is seen as more appropriate when indicators are used as specific examples of change[3]. These criteria also reflect more the value attached to the active involvement and the perception of (different groups of) participants in the process of defining and monitoring indicators.

Another set of properties of indicators

- *Subjective*
  If informants have a special position or experience that gives them unique insights, information that may be seen by others as anecdotal can be critical data because of the source's value.

- *Participatory*
  Indicators should be developed together with those best placed to assess them. This may mean target groups or beneficiaries, but can also be other stakeholders

- *Interpreted and communicable*
  Locally defined indicators may not mean much to other stakeholders: people can come up with indicators that have a very specific and important meaning in their social context, but mean nothing to outsiders. In that case it might be necessary to explain them.

- *Cross-checked and compared*
  The validity of assessments needs to be cross-checked, by comparing different indicators and progress, and by using different informants, methods and researchers. Different views and interests in a community should be reflected.

- *Empowering*
  The process of setting and assessing indicators should be empowering in itself and allow groups and individuals to reflect critically on their changing situation.

- *Diverse and disaggregated*
  There should be a deliberate effort to seek out different indicators from a range of groups, especially men and women. This information needs to be recorded in such a way that these differences can be assessed over time.

Guideline:
The two sets of qualities of indicators are not mutually exclusive. It depends largely on the approach used and the nature of the programme and its interventions which combination of qualities is appropriate. Involvement of the intended beneficiaries or other stakeholders in identification of indicators is always important: Which indicators are significant for them? Which are the signs that tell them that something has changed?

3.2.4 Criteria related to the collection and use of result information

In designing the programme and choosing the indicators, the following issues should be considered in order to make sure that the result information that the indicator provides will be useful and reliable, and will be used for the intended purpose.

Collection of information on results
- What is the nature of the result information?
- How and how often will it be collected? Is that feasible, in terms of time, human capacity, cost? Does the organisation have access to that information?
- By whom will it be collected: participants or beneficiaries of activities, staff of the organisation (which levels)? Have they also been involved in the design of the programme and the selection of the indicators?

[3] Roche: Impact Assessment for Development Agencies.

- What stake or interest do they have in collecting the information, and in doing it in a reliable way? Do they use the information themselves? If not, do they know what the information is used for?
- Do they have the necessary skills?

Analysis of the result information
Who will analyse the information on results? Be aware that analysis always means interpretation, it is a process of selecting data, giving meaning to it and deciding if it is important or not. Often, the person(s) analysing the information for purposes of management, decision-making or reporting are not the same person(s) who identified the indicator or collected the information. Maybe they would interpret the information quite differently.
Whenever possible, but especially when it concerns analysis of the effects of activities and interventions on the lives of participants or beneficiaries, analysis of result information should be a joint process with all relevant stakeholders; or at least the results of the analysis should be shared and checked with them.

Use of result information
- Who are the users of the information within (different levels?) and outside the organisation?
- For what purposes: is the information needed and used for ongoing management, internal or external reporting purposes, internal learning and reflection, strategic planning and decision-making? Which information do you need for which purpose?

Learning from results and from the result assessment process
- Who is learning from the process of collecting, processing and analysing the information, and is this knowledge shared?
- If you intend to use result information in a structural way for internal organisational learning processes, how is this organised?

IV Which indicators to propose to Hivos?

Which indicators to select depends largely on the objectives of the programme, the level and time-span of the intervention and the type of strategy used:

- different indicators are used for different type of results: output, effect, impact;

- different indicators are needed for results at the level of direct beneficiaries of an activity, at the level of intermediary actors such as local authorities, and for results at institutional level such as changes in legislation or the composition of decision-making bodies;

- different indicators are needed for different type of strategies and activities, such as capacity building, lobby/ advocacy activities, organisation of people at community level, artistic production, ICT-based networking, etc.

Every partner organisation needs to identify which indicators are relevant and feasible to collect in relation to their own objectives and expected results. Much of that information is needed for the management of the daily work and for internal planning: Hivos doesn't need to know all those indicators.
The same goes for indicators related to context: changes in the context often have an influence on the achievement of your results. It is advisable to identify and monitor some relevant indicators for changes in the context, in order to be able to adapt strategies in time and to relate results to specific interventions over a longer period. The choice of contextual factors to monitor should be determined by the question how crucial they are for the achievement of your objectives. They may also be formulated as risks and opportunities.

In the preparation of the contract, Hivos requests partners to propose:
1. Indicators for output and outreach: output and outreach of the main programme(s) or activities should be specified (where possible, quantified) for the first year and estimated for the whole

contract period. For consecutive years, they should be specified in the Annual (work)plans.

2. Indicators for effects of the interventions: the most important expected results at effect level (for the contract period), with the related indicators and the way they will be assessed.

> In selecting the 'most important' expected results, please do so in relation to your long-term objectives: which (intermediate) results do you expect will contribute the most to the achievement of the intended change? Which results are the most important to the intended beneficiaries?

3. Indicators for results related to organisational quality or organisational change: one (or more) objective and the intended results of improvement of an aspect of the own organisation, with related indicators, for the period of the contract.
   For example: quality of internal learning processes, expertise of staff, quality of the relation with stakeholders, quality of delivery of services, etc.

NB The choice of indicators for monitoring the expected results during the contract period should be argumented: why is this set considered the most relevant and useful by the partner?

Guidelines:
Level of ambition: choose indicators for results that are – at least partly - within your *control* and capability, and for which you can take *responsibility* in view of (the scope of) your interventions. Output is within the organisation's control. With regard to effects: every organisation should take responsibility for the direct effects that it aims to have with its interventions.

> Indicators for longer-term effects and impact on for example people's lives or decision-making processes are useful to place your activities and strategies in the perspective of the 'change' you want to contribute to, and to assess that contribution over time.
> But impact indicators should in principle not be part of the contract agreement with Hivos, as impact is in general not 'measurable' in one contract period.
>
> Longer-term effects can be the focus of an evaluation after a long period of intervention, especially in the case of a large organisation, or if the organisation plays a very decisive role in a specific sector or process. Evaluating impact in general demands the evaluation of more organisations working towards the same goal.

- Number of indicators: what is a sensible number of indicators depends on the scope of the objectives and the programme of the organisation.
  For the contract agreement with Hivos, the following guideline can be given:

  1 *Output and outreach:* 2 indicators/targets for output and 1 for outreach, per programme or main activity.

  2 *Effect*:
  > 3 effect indicators for an organisation receiving project funding for a specific project or activity;
  > 6 effect indicators for an organisation receiving programme funding or institutional funding, that have a range of activities at different intervention levels.
  Think of indicators related to different types of results and different groups of beneficiaries and other target groups, such as policy makers.

  3 *Organisational quality*: depending on the number of objectives: 1 or 2 indicators.

> NB How many indicators an organisation needs for its own information and use is of course its own decision. In general, the advice is to keep it limited and to look for the essential.
>
> As far as Hivos is concerned: the funding proposal may contain many more indicators, but any selection of more than ten indicators as core for reporting to Hivos during the contract will be

questioned: are they all necessary, which ones are the most relevant for the (main) objectives?

V Examples of indicators and their use

5.1 Output

Often, an output target is an indicator in itself, for example:

- activities realised: 10 trainings, 1 conference, weekly women's credit group meeting organised;
- 5 new member organisations enrolled; 500 leaflets produced and distributed; research on subject X conducted + report published, etc.

In other cases, the indicator is clear but the target is more difficult to plan in quantitative terms, because the result is not totally in control of the organisation. This is the case if the result is for example depending on the demand or response of people to services (e.g. emission of loans), or on other external factors (e.g. increase in production, number of cases brought to court, etc.).
Often, it will be possible (and advisable) to set a target on the basis of experiences in the past and other available data. If not, baseline information for that indicator should be collected, in order to monitor the increase (and the factors of influence) and set a realistic target for the year after.

Direct outreach is also an output indicator, for example:

- number of participants (F/M) in activities;
- 'quality' of participants (meaning: did you reach the intended group?) in activities;
- number of organisations responding to an invitation for a conference;
- number and quality of people making use of services.

NB Indirect outreach is a result at effect level: if your activity aims to reach or benefit a wider group via a direct 'target' group (e.g. the participants in a training), it depends on how they used the 'output'. For example: did the trained women leaders organised meetings with other women in their villages? Did the farmers use their increased income for the benefit of their family (or for other purposes)? If your 'channel' is not people but another medium, the effect depends - among other things - on the question if you chose the right channel: did your message reach the intended public?

5.2 Effect or outcome

Most development interventions are part of a long-term process with a goal at impact level. The gap between concrete activities of one actor and the achievement of that goal is often enormous. The intervention process can be viewed as a chain of objectives and results of short- and mid-term activities, reaching 'intermediate' results on the way to - and contributing to - the achievement of the envisaged goal (Ref. II: intervention or programme logic: if ... then).
Results at effect level are often intermediate results, on the way to achieving a higher level objective or goal. For example: an organisation that fights violence against women, organised a lobby campaign to make violence against women punishable by law. It results in a change in legislation: a good result. But the adoption of the law does not lead automatically to a positive impact on the situation of battered women: the law must be implemented, the attitude of the police and other judicial actors towards women need to change, women must be aware of their rights in this respect, have access to legal support and need to feel safe and confident enough to report to the police when they are assaulted, etc.

Other examples of types of indicators for intermediate results[4] (effects):

- increase in participation of specific groups of primary stakeholders (F/M) in relevant decision-making structures;
- increased access of the target group to information, resources, services or infrastructure;
- response to (lobby) activities by media, authorities, other actors;
- adoption of legislation, establishment of monitoring or accountability mechanisms;
- other actors show interest in taking up similar practices, or other multiplier effects.

[4] Please note that these indicators need to be further specified in relation to the objective: what exactly is to be 'measured'? Indicators for 'capacity', 'participation' of 'access' are in fact an 'umbrella' type of indicator, needing specification for each specific objective and situation.

Examples of indicators for intermediate results related to the 'process' quality of the intervention: • inclusive/ participatory approach, ownership, accountability: higher levels of involvement, initiative, (feeling of) ownership and self-esteem of people involved; • inclusion of gender perspective: increase in active involvement and demands of women (groups) • process contributes to capacity building: increased agency and leadership of members of marginalised groups

5.3 Impact

As stated before, impact indicators are important for the assessment of long-term effects of development interventions, the changes that have a significant and/or sustained effect on people's lives or on society as a whole. Very seldom to be attributed to the actions of one single organisation. Impact indicators are normally not part of an agreement with Hivos, but each organisation may identify impact indicators to monitor its results over time.

Some examples of results and indicators at impact level:

- improved control of women over reproductive decisions: decreasing difference between actual number of children and desired number of children
- improved access to the market: change in market share of a specific group of producers
- more transparent, accountable state behaviour: status, independence, accessibility and decision record of an institution for monitoring of non-discrimination legislation
- sustained improvement of standard of living: improved ability to cope with crises

5.4 Examples of indicators for results of lobby or advocacy activities

Output and direct outreach

- number + relevance (agenda, timing) of activities and products (meetings, campaigns, brochures)
- number, quality (intended group?) and appreciation of participants in activities

Effect

Response

- attention/ coverage in media (number, quality, appreciation/ tone)
- reactions to media coverage (from the public, authorities, other stakeholders in the issue)
- number of requests for information, brochures, etc. + appreciation, translations, evidence of use
- appreciation/ acknowledgement: e.g. invitations for participation in activities of other actors (which actors + status: what is their role/ importance in discussion and decision-making?)

Agenda setting

- public support of the organisation's standpoint by others (number, status, in what form)
- adoption of the organisation's standpoint by (important) stakeholders (which stakeholders, number, status)
- changes in discourse (language) and/or standpoints of parties involved, authorities, etc. (positive and negative, incl. efforts to distract attention from the subject)
- success in involving new stakeholders in the discussion

Increased capacity and pressure

- taking up (or follow-up) of the initiative or issue by other actors
- increase in support base/ number and quality of allies for the organisation's standpoint (locally, nationally, internationally)

quality of alliances/ networks (number + status participants, dynamism, relevance of strategies, track record/ successes)

5.5 Some sector specific examples

NB These examples are based on practices of Hivos partners, but have been modified for more general use and don't represent one specific organisation.

Organisation for sustainable agriculture
Main goals of a programme on non-pesticidal management: improved income from agricultural production that is economically, environmentally and socially sustainable; empowerment of farmers, in particular women; conservation of biodiversity.

Main indicators for success at effect and impact level, as viewed by the organisation:
- decreased cost of production
- increased knowledge and skills of farmers (problem diagnosis, toxic effects, marketing strategies)
- reduce of debts with money lenders
- increase in women's participation and 'voice' in meetings, increase in amount of savings of women
- increased demand of villages and groups for support by the organisation.

Specific indicators to monitor:
- output: yield/ crop production, application of different crop protection methods, real costs of plant protection, revenues of different crops
- output: participation of different target groups (F/M) in the programme, in trainings and meetings
- effect: level of adoption of different crop protection methods
- effect: incidence of pests
- effect: increase/ decrease in net income of farmers
- effect: change in attitudes of women and men with regard to participation and 'voice' of women
- effect: increase in number and activity of farmers groups

Organisation fighting violence against women
Main goals of the programme: increased awareness of women and general public on women's human rights (with focus on violence), psychological and legal support to assaulted women, improvement of legal status of women regarding physical integrity.

Main indicators for success as viewed by the organisation:
- increased demand for and level of appreciation of the support by women 'clients'
- increased number of court cases won
- increased perception of violence as a gender issue by legal authorities, police and general public
- adoption of changes in family and criminal law that improve the legal status and protection of women and girls
- adoption of changes in criminal law that increase possibilities of prosecution of offenders

Specific indicators to monitor:
- output and outreach: number of assaulted women contacting the organisation, number of women participating in the programme + appreciation, number and quality of other actors contacting the organisation + nature of contact and follow-up
- output and outreach: number and appreciation of participants in awareness activities for different target groups, demand for and appreciation of information material
- effect: number of women going to court, number of cases won (or settlements made), nature/ content of verdict and penalty
- effect: changes in attitude, language, discourse of judges, lawyers, police involved
- effect: number and content of media coverage of court cases, of violence against women in general and of proposals for legal change
- effect: increase in support for proposals for legal change (number and quality of allies, response to lobby campaigns, response of members of parliament, increase in members of network, etc.)

Organisation for rural community development
Main goal of the organisation: improved empowerment of rural communities to transform their own lives in an equitable, economically dynamic and environmentally sustainable manner.

The organisation supports community initiatives in identifying priorities and planning, implementing and monitoring their activities. To ensure quality and equity of the decision-making and the choice of activities, the groups engage in a ongoing process of self-assessment, using (jointly defined) community indicators for participation, social inclusion, gender, equitability, satisfaction and sustainability.
Some other indicators used:

- number of very poor people (locally defined) engaged in activities
- increase in number of beneficiaries (esp. women) in leadership positions
- indicators for increased income of community members involved in economic activities

Organisation using film for raising debate on social and political issues
The main goal of the organisation is to groom an audience for African films and to use film to promote reflection by society on socio-economic and political issues.
The organisation registers data regarding distribution, frequency of screening, the number and quality of audiences, network activities, etc. An example of qualitative monitoring of response/ effect they use: after showing a movie in a rural or urban area, they invite some people from the public for a short interview that they also film. The persons interviewed share their opinion on the movie, what it did to them, and how it relates to their personal lives.

Website
A Central American network aims to provide organisations in the region working on the same issues with key documents via a website. Free available web statistics are installed to monitor the use of the website. They focus on a few items in the long list of statistics:

- number of hits per country
- number of visits to different pages of the website

The statistics provide the management information to monitor the targets they had set per country. However, the website statistics do not offer insights into the reason why in some countries the site was used less than expected. Additional indicators are needed, such as:

- characteristics of the actual users of the website
- number of targeted organisations with a functioning internet connection and sufficient speed to download documents
- number of other websites with a link to the site of the network
- relevance of the website information for the organisations

To know more about the effects of the information on the site, the network organises client satisfaction surveys and selective telephone interviews with questions such as:

- how do the organisations use the information on the site? (work, lobby, research, personal interest)
- do they share the information with colleagues within or outside the organisation?