REPORT

PERFORMANCE MONITORING WORKSHOP

Funded by: USAID/EPIQ TANZANIA

Hotel Sea Cliff - Dar es Salaam
May 25-27,1998

Submitted by: Elza Suely Anderson
Consultant/MSI

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACRONYMS

AWF	African Wildlife Foundation
CBNRM	Community-Based Natural Resource Management
CBC	Community-Based Conservation
CCSC-AWF	Community Conservation Services Center
DOI	US Department of the Interior
EPIQ	Environmental Policy and Institutional Strengthening IQC
GREENCOM	Environmental Education and Communication Project of USAID
ICM	Integrated Coastal Management
IQC	Indefinite Quantity Contract
IRs	Intermediate Results
MSI	Management Systems International
NEMC	National Environment Management Council
NGOs	Non-Government Organizations
NRM	Natural Resource Management
PM	Performance Monitoring
PMP	Performance Monitoring Plan
RF	Results Framework
RP	Results Package
RPT	Results Package Team
SO	Strategic Objective
SOT	Strategic Objective Team
TCMP	Tanzania Coastal Management Partnership
UGR	Ugalla Game Reserve
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WMAs	Wildlife Management Areas
WWF	World Wildlife Fund

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report summarizes a 3-day Workshop on Performance Monitoring held May 25-27, 1998 at the Hotel Sea Cliff in Dar es Salaam Tanzania. The purpose of the workshop was to familiarize participants with an approach to monitoring and evaluation that was relatively new to most 'of them, the Results Framework. This approach focuses on results, results packages, teamwork, and achieving, bringing a new light to these concepts. The Results Framework emerged from USAID's accumulated experience with monitoring and evaluation, and it is a more simple and useful tool for managing and reporting on'. program performance.

More specifically, the workshop was designed to provide the participants wit 1 e concepts and skills necessary to develop Performance Monitoring Plans that can be of use to the organizations they work with, as well as to the USAID/Tanzania Strategic Objective for Environment and Natural Resources Management (commonly known as the S02 Program). Twenty participants representing fourteen organizations attended the workshop, which was facilitated by two outside consultants (Alan Lessik and Suely Anderson), plus Hawa Msham from EPIQ (Participant List - Annex 1).

In addition to the Workshop Agenda, the Workshop Objectives and the "Magic Words", which were included in each workshop folder (Annex 2), participants received copies of several materials used throughout the event, such as power point screens, overheads, excerpts from publications and bibliography lists. A detailed workshop agenda with time allocations and indications of responsibilities can be found in Annex 3. The workshop made use of a variety of methodologies to promote participation and the establishment of a comfortable learning environment. These methodologies included: a) two facilitators; b) two guest speakers (Paul Siegel from WWF and Mark Renzi from EPIQ); c) power point presentations, overheads and charts; d) exercises and games with contents related to specific workshop sessions; and e) work groups and plenary presentations.

The workshop covered a wide range of topics related to Performance Monitoring, such as: a) what are Results Frameworks and how to build them; b) how to state a Strategic Objective and Intermediate Results; c) how to distinguish Results from Activities; d) what are the attributes of Performance Indicators and the importance of identifying the most adequate ones for each Intermediate Result (the fewer the better); e) how to manage data for monitoring and reporting on Results; f) how to incorporate Assumptions in a Results Framework; and g) how to design Monitoring Plans understanding the concept of Results Packages and Results Package Teams. Topics such as the value of Participation and Institutional Strengthening were also integrated into the workshop, to reinforce the idea of teamwork and capacity building in Performance Monitoring.

Concrete advancements made during the workshop include common understanding an practice of concepts related to Performance Monitoring, as well as initial work on development of actual Monitoring Plans for EPIQ, the Ugalla Ecosystem, and GreenCom.

The workshop outcome was very positive. The agenda was accomplished as planned, the proposed objectives were achieved, and the workshop assessment applied at the end revealed a high level of satisfaction among participants. Briefly highlighting some of the participants comments, they were as follows:

- Much greater understanding of the need and relevance for Performance Monitoring:
- Innovative type workshop, not tedious, and to the point;
- It has made my work more clear;
- It created a spirit of team work;
- The workshop topic was new to me, so I gained knowledge, skills and attitude in relation to Performance Monitoring;
- I gained skills in designing Performance Monitoring Plans;
- I've learned to focus on achieving Results, rather than implementing a project;
- It broadened my perception regarding Assumptions and Indicators; and

What I've learned in this workshop will really help me in my day-to-day activities.

1. INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND.

1. Acknowledgments

Credits for the success of this workshop go to people such as:

- Alan Lessik, who brought expertise in Performance Monitoring;
- Mark Renzi, who had the vision and the determination to build partnership capacity in monitoring program performance;
- Hawa Msharn, who dedicated much effort and time to bringing participants together and helped with workshop preparation;
- Eunice Odunga, who helped with workshop logistics and preparation;
- Frank Manda, who patiently spent time making copies and sorting out the materials for the participants;
- Carole Jolly, who kindly designed the charts used for the sessions on Data
- Management and Participation; and
- All the participants, who actively participated, asked questions, worked in groups and greatly contributed with their experience for the enrichment of the workshop.

2. Purpose o the Workshop

The major purpose for this workshop was to build the capacity of EPIQ staff and partners on Performance Monitoring, so that they are able to develop Monitoring Plans to track program performance. While it is true that many of the participants had skills in collecting data and reporting, few were familiar with the concepts of Performance Monitoring and how Monitoring Plans can serve as useful tools for data management, reporting and achieving results. As a facilitator for the achievement of the S02 Program, EPIQ planned for this workshop in a very timely fashion, when most projects and programs are just getting started. The workshop represented an excellent opportunity for EPIQ and partners to become familiar with Performance Monitoring, Results Framework, Results Packages, Results Package Teams and how it all relates to the S02 Program and their own programs and projects.

After this workshop, it became clear to the participants that developing Monitoring and is not something one does just to fulfill the donor's requirements. Monitoring Plans are very important and useful tools that can serve the purpose of reporting to donors timely and efficiently, thus contributing to the flow of information and ensuring the continuation of funding, and at the same time they can serve many other purposes, such as exchanging information among partners, communicating with customers, and summarizing information in a thorough and comprehensive way. Performance Monitoring Plans can make life easier for project managers, and contribute to strengthening organizations.

II. WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES

Expectations for the workshop, as expressed by participants, were the following

1. Learn about Performance Monitoring;
2. Design a PMP;
3. Program level PM;
4. Clarity in what to achieve and where we are going;
5. Devise indicators;
6. Demystify Monitoring and Evaluation;
7. Practical guidance on indicators;
8. Measuring service delivery;
9. PMP can be integrated in development of Ugalla;
10. Practical experience about monitoring;
11. Understand performance management;
12. Develop and produce a PMP;
13. Guidelines for monitoring and evaluation;
14. Improve knowledge of monitoring and evaluation; and
15. Learn how we are doing as a team.

These expectations were very much in tune with the eight objectives the workshop set to accomplish (Annex 2). For most of the participants, the workshop objectives were achieved (80 to 1 00%). In the assessment form, however, most of them reported that time was too short to properly cover all issues, and the one objective that was least achieved was the last one: Design a Performance Monitoring Plan. Most participants felt that there was not enough time allocated in the workshop to achieve this particular objective, even though most of the third day was dedicated to designing Performance Monitoring Plans. The trouble is that this task indeed takes time, and requires team work. It is a process that goes back and forth, with designing and re-designing as the team moves along. What is important is that the workshop provided the basis for how to carry on this process, and that is how much one could expect from a 3-day workshop on Performance Monitoring. The continuation of this process will depend on technical assistance to individual organizations, which could be provided by EPIQ.

After this session participants were divided into 3 groups and did the "Alien Invasion exercise, as an icebreaker and also to get them actively involved in planning and seeking information. The underlying message was the need to focus on what is useful and reliable information.

III. PERFORMANCE MONITORING

1. What is Performance Monitoring.

Performance Monitoring is an innovative approach to monitoring and evaluation, which emphasize Results. As stated before, it is a more direct and simple approach to monitoring and evaluation, that gears up project managers to achieving Results. As in other monitoring and evaluation approaches, it relies on a cause-effect logic, but here the hierarchy is not so rigid. Intermediate Results can maintain a cause-effect relationship on a more flexible way, both horizontally and vertically. The arrows connecting the Intermediate Results can go in many directions, and sometimes and Intermediate Result at the bottom of a Results Framework can have arrows connecting directly to the Strategic Objective on the top.

Perhaps the neatest thing that can be said in favor of Performance Monitoring is that it shifts the focus of managers from project or program implementation to achieving results. Projects and programs become -means to an end (achieving results), rat6er than the end itself Instead of describing goals, objectives, outputs and inputs -- with specific sets of indicators, means of verification and assumptions for each level, which often led to confusion, repetition and lots of paperwork -- Performance Monitoring is simpler. All a project manager has to be able to say is what results he/she is trying to achieve. It also emphasizes teamwork and participation in a very explicit way, which was not always true for other approaches to monitoring and evaluation.

2. Why this approach to monitoring and evaluation.

This approach to monitoring and evaluation emerged from USAID's accumulated experience with keeping track of project and program performance in a timely and effective way. It is an approach intended to fulfill the functions of planning, management, communication (which includes building understanding and increasing ownership), and reporting. It is founded on practical experience and it is management driven, as opposed to report driven.

When compared to the Logical Framework, for example, the Results Framework simplifies the concepts by naming all different levels of objectives as Intermediate Results. Each tool, however, has its preferred applications. Where the <u>major player</u> and the necessary <u>outputs</u> are clear, the logframe would be preferred. Where <u>uncertainity</u> or <u>lack of control</u> is high, the Results Framework would be preferred. The Results Framework is a better tool to analyze performance information to learn, re-plan and improve performance. The concept of Achieving, which is central to the Performance Monitoring, brings up the idea that monitoring is a learning process, flexible, collaborative, interrelated yet self-contained, result-focused, and time-limited in terms of activities. In Performance Monitoring, the linkage between achievement of results and budgeting is more explicit, as well as the joint planning and programming.

Evaluations are only carried out when necessary and/or desired, and not mandatory, as they used to be in previous monitoring and evaluation systems. During the workshop, participants were presented with the Logical Framework and the ZOPP approaches to monitoring and evaluation, so that they could have a basis for comparison when introduced to the Results Framework. They could see the graphic display of all three approaches, in terms of "trees", but at the same time they could see the differences of each "tree" in terms of its logic and cause-effect relations.

IV. THE RESULTS FRAMEWORK

The Results Framework was introduced on the first day, after participants were familiar with each other, had established the group norms based on principles of adult learning, and had already discussed the workshop agenda, expectations and objectives. The flow of the presentation on the Results Framework is detailed on page 2 of the workshop notes (Annex 4), where some of the participants' comments were captured. Alan Lessik, responsible for this session, exhibited a series of six power point screens that can be found in Annex 5. Perhaps the most important aspect to highlight in this report in relation to the Results Framework is the Logical Association between SOs and IRs, where one has a result statement at the center that specifies "For whom" and "By whom", and arrows going down asking "How", arrows going up asking "Why", and arrows going to both sides asking "What else?". On the side, one has to ask: "Assuming what?". The screen for that is #1 1, and it can be found in Annex 5.

1. **Strategic Objective & Strategic Objective Team**

During this session Alan Lessik succeeded in providing the participants with a very solid basis on what is an Strategic Objective: "The most ambitious result in a particular program or project area that an operating unit (with its partners) can materially affect and for which it is willing to be held accountable." It is important, though, as Lessik noted, not to set it too high, as opposed to what was normally done in the logical framework, where sometimes the "goal" was so high that it could never be achieved during the life of a program or project. An Strategic Objective represents a significant development result - clear, precise and objectively measurable. It should be uni-dimensional, as much as possible.

In addition to presenting the basic concepts underlying the Results Framework, Lessik also presented a screen which provided the context for the S02 Program, showing the four teams (or working groups):

1. National Parks
2. Community Based Conservation;
3. Coastal Management; and
4. Game Reserves.

The core team is composed by USAID. The Extended Team who will interact wit i USAID includes key Partners. This presentation was very useful to the participants, especially the ones who were not familiar with the S02 Program and who is involved. It also paved the road to the upcoming meeting at Mafia Island in June 22-25, 1998, when the S02 Program will be discussed in more detail.

2. Focus on Results (Intermediate Results)

In the afternoon of the first day, before Lessik's presentation on how to define results, participants had the opportunity to work on some cause-effect exercises. First, in plenary, they worked on arranging a very simple example displayed in overhead (Annex 5). Then they received hand-outs with more examples, using the same approach, where they had to number the options according to cause-effect (instructions on the hand-outs, Annex 5). Then they were divided into three groups to practice on a more complex exercise that had 14 statements. The purpose was to get the participants to think in terms of cause'-effect, and even though the exercises could be improved, a few lessons were learned such as:

- Results should have cear statements;
- The logic is not chronological, it is causal (if - then);
- Value of team work when developing Results Frameworks;
- There is a considerable amount of struggle in building a RF;.
- It is important to be able to switch from where you start (top or bottom) when building a RF, and usually the most difficult part lays in the middle, where IRs have to be organized as necessary and sufficient conditions to achieve the SO; and
- The group in charge of building an RF should feel free to drop what doesn't fit and able to recognize when an issue is cross-cutting, an activity or an assumption.

After this exercise Lessik presented a series of screens (Annex 5 on t e c Results statements, stressing that a Result is not an activity or objective. Each result statement should be unidimensional, measurable and objectively verifiable.

Intermediate Results are lower level results which contribute directly and clearly to other IRs or the SO. Lessik showed some excellent examples of "Don'ts" in Results Statements, related to chronological and categorical linkages, which really helped clarify some of the common mistakes to be avoided.

Lessik's presentations were followed by an exercise on how to build a RF, based on real life example on Education from USAID/Jamaica. Participants were divided into three groups, and each group received a set of IR statements (I 4 total) cut up in pieces. The task was to build a RF with the pieces. During the groups' presentations there was a consensus on the SO. The last group to present came closer to what was done in Jamaica. One participant commented that in a RF what is important doesn't necessarily have to appear on top. Example: Policy could come at the bottom. It just needs to appear somehow. Finally, Lessik distributed to participants the key of how it was done in Jamaica.

3. Results Packages & Results Package Teams

These concepts were presented to participants on the last day of the workshop, just before the introduction to Performance Monitoring Plans (Annex 7).

A Results Package is the basic managerial concept through which institutions may organize and execute work to achieve results within a specified time and budget. It is flexible and directly linked to the achievement of results, not mechanisms to accomplish the result. A Results Package consists of activities, funding, personnel, analyzes, authorities and associated documentation. The creation of a Results Package has to be approved by the Core SO Team. The design of a RP can be based on related results, or on commonalties, as Lessik showed in a series of screens, using the example of a RF with the following SO: "Better production practices adopted by farmers in the Upper River Zone."

Results Package Teams are responsible for the achievement of specific results(s) through activities. They report to the 50 Team and should have specific authorities granted to them for carrying out activities. This aspect of Performance Monitoring is very important because it emphasizes the idea of teamwork. It brings people with different knowledge together to solve problems. Teams should be empowered to achieve results.

4. Results Activities

The ability to distinguish Results from Activities was presented first thing in the morning of Day 2 by Alan Lessik. He used a few screens (Annex 6), reminding participants that they have to be aware of how easy it is to confuse activities with the desired results. To avoid such confusion, the group has to be constantly asking questions such as: a) What will this activity accomplish?; b) What difference do we expect to see with this set of activities?; and c) How will we know if things have changed in the way that we want them to?. Activities are steps or means to achieve results. Once an IR is clearly defined, it is easy to visualize the activities that need to be implemented in order to achieve that result. Sometimes one feels more comfortable to begin listing the activities and then get to the desired results. The order in which the process is accomplished doesn't matter. As mentioned before, building a RF is an interactive process involving going back and forth, thinking and re-thinking. What is important is that, at the end, this process leads to a clearer thinking, better statement of results, and full comprehension of the activities that need to take place in order for results to be achieved.

Lessik chose three IRs from the Jamaica case study to illustrate defining activities once the Results Statements are clear. A few activities were brainstormed with participants in relation to the following IRs:

Improved management of schools;
Improved effectiveness of school headmaster administrators; and
Improved record keeping & database management.

To finalize this sessions Lessik presented a chart with probing questions, asking for the participants' input:

1. Press workshop completed: Where are we going with this? Participants respond, and Lessik kept asking questions about "improved reporting" response, going all the way to the activities necessary to achieve the desired result.

2. Management Plans Submitted: How this can be stated as a result? Answers: improved management, infrastructure needs assessed (Alan showed how it can build up).

3. NGOs strengthened through training: Here you have to divide it and deal with the strengthening part, and the training part, which usually goes down to lower levels.

V. INDICATORS & INDICES

Indicators are the heart of the Performance Monitoring Plans. They consist o measures/markers that describe how well results are being achieved. They are intimately related to IRs. They are indispensable management tools for making performance-based decisions. This session was part of Day 2, and materials distributed to participants regarding indicators can be found in Annex 6. On the overhead "What are Indicators", one of the participants added the remark that they provide useful information for reporting to different customers.

A series of six overheads were presented during this session, which referred to w at are indicators, categories of indicators, attributes of a good indicator, steps to selecting performance indicators, performance baseline, and indicator adequacy. Participants received copies of all these overheads, plus brief definitions of the attributes of a good indicator. Excerpts from materials related to indicators were also distributed, so that participants could have many sources to look after when trying to define indicators for the SO and IRs. In a RF, "the fewer the better" was emphasized.

A group exercise was applied in the afternoon of Day 2, after the session on. ata Management. First participants were introduced to a chart with four steps: 1) identify indicator; 2) set quantity; 3) set quality; and 4) specify time. As the indicator statement grew with each step, it was uncovered. Then participants were asked to divide in groups, the same ones used for the Jamaica Education example on how to build a RF from Day 1. The three groups were asked to define indicators for five of the 14 IRs, randomly chosen, and were able to work with three IRs within the time limit of the exercise. The indicators devised by the groups captured the concept, and many were able to incorporate quantity, quality and time. Afterwards participants were presented with the monitoring plan from Jamaica, and could compare how they had defined the indicators for the proposed IRs.

The session on Indices only happened on Day 3, led by Alan Lessik (Annex . . e showed a series of six screens on what is an index, how to develop and use one, and how to define indicators from indices. In summary, an Index is a measurement tool that allows the measurement of qualitative changes, while reporting those changes quantitatively. As reminded by one of the participants, it is important to be very parsimonious when using indices. The need for using indices has to be carefully assessed. Two examples from the USAID mission in Brazil were distributed to participants, to illustrate how indices could be built. These examples came from the Environmental SO for the USAID/Brazil mission (Annex 7).

VI. DATA MANAGEMENT

This session took place on Day 2, in two phases. One was the presentation made by Pau Siegel (WWF) in the morning, on "Dealing with Data: an Activity Index for Improved Project Management" (Annex 6). Siegel mentioned that data is what one is actually going to measure. He explained that his approach is to focus on activity indicators, as opposed to impact indicators, and that the process of standardization is useful when one has to deal with different sets of results. In the lack of baseline, one can measure trends. Siegel provided clarification to the confusion between correlation (when two things change together) and causality (when changes in one thing affect changes in another). He showed a series of overheads on his work in Madagascar and explained how his team had to standardize the information and score them. According to his experience, this is a useful way to compress and make sense of loads of data. He adds that good managers have to be creative and able to "digest" information. He agrees, however, that it is much better to plan well ahead and define the necessary and sufficient kinds of data collection, so one doesn't have to deal with loads of data afterwards.

The second phase of this session also took place on Day 2, after lunch, wit t e exercise on Indicators in between. Right after this exercise we had a short icebreaker on Music, when participants were asked to indicate the best songs, albums, bands or singer in Tanzania, with the purpose of illustrating that we are always using criteria when we make our choices. This is true in life, as well as in Performance Monitoring and Data Collection. The session began with a chart design portraying two people (a man and a woman) carrying bags full of letters from the alphabet, with the heading: "How much is necessary and sufficient?" At first participants referred to the fact that the woman was carrying less weight as usual, that the woman was smarter, etc., until they finally realized that the chart was related to Data Collection and was intended to demonstrate that it is better and smarter to collect only the necessary and sufficient information.

Following this brief introduction, participants were presented with four overheads on Data, which stressed the fact that data is not free, that it is better to plan for it and organize it using forms, databases, etc. Important points to consider 'in primary data collection are the unit of analysis, the desegregation needs, the sampling techniques, and the data collecting instruments. Major types of methodologies for data collection were presented and commented, with participants mentioning that case studies, questionnaires, key informant interviews, rapid appraisal and direct observations were the most common ones that they used. The importance of data analysis was one of the overheads, which stressed a point already made by Siegel that one has to plan for it. Data analysis can be very time consuming when people don't plan ahead about how they are going to organize and analyze the data collected. Some participants added that often times lots of data are gathered and never analyzed, just sitting on bookshelves.

A variety of materials from USAID and other sources were distributed to participants on different methodologies for data collection, for further consultation (Annex 6).

VII. ASSUMPTION

This session took place on Day 2, right after the session on Data Management. an Lessik began with an exercise called "The Cash Register Exercise", which leads participants to distinguish between facts and perceptions and is an example of the verbal distortion to which we are all prone. A copy of this exercise can be found in Annex 6. It worked very well as an introduction to the session on Assumptions, which was then followed by a series of four screens that depicted Assumptions as external factors, other donor/partner efforts, hopes and wishes, and our blind spots. The conclusion was that we should try to narrow down our assumptions. We don't always know what is going to happen, and we should be careful about the assumptions we make.

Usually, in a graphical version of the RF assumptions are presented as shadowed boxes or are not represented at all, but included in the text.

VIII. PARTICIPATION.

This was a very brief session, mostly meant to highlight the value of participation in Performance Monitoring to promote empowerment and ownership. The session began with the presentation of the chart above, and it was interesting to observe that participants didn't immediately relate to what it represented (the decreasing role of the technician and the increasing empowerment of the customer). When asked about what they saw in the chart, responses initially varied from "adults and children", to "children growing, up", etc. It took them a while to see the representation of empowerment, which seems to be a new concept for the majority of the participants. After that two overheads were presented (Annex 6), with key points on Participation and its role in Performance Monitoring. One of the overheads covered the key questions that should be asked whenever one is thinking of Participation, such as why, what level is desired and affordable, and the cost of participatory approaches in terms of time, money, human resources, methodologies, etc.

IX. INSTITUTIONAL STRENGTHENING

Mark Renzi (EPIQ) was in charge of this session, and what he did was to present a too that he developed while working in Namibia (Life Program), the Institutional Development Framework. He showed a series of 14 power point screens, beginning with the "Paradox of Monitoring" and ending with the "Profile Results". Mostly, what his presentation did was to convey to participants that there are very useful and precise ways of measuring the level of institutional development, that can help institutions become aware of their strengths and weaknesses. A copy of the material he presented can be found in Annex 6.

X. WORKSHOP ASSESSMENT AND CONCLUSION

Having covered all the basic concepts, Day 3 was mostly dedicated to eve oping Performance Monitoring Plans. Participants received a PMP form with two sheets (Annex 7), and were divided into three working groups. One group worked on the PMP for EPIQ and made great advancement, defining the SO and 7 IRs. This was a very useful exercise, which got them started on the RF for EPIQ. The second group worked on the RF for the Ugalla Ecosystem and was able to make some progress, although not all the right people were present to make the experience as useful as possible. The third group was composed of Irma Allen and Paul Siegel, and they worked on the PMP for GreenCom. h-ma reported that she found it very helpful to have a partner to share ideas with, as she was actually in the process of developing a PMP for GreeCom. This group, as well as the second group for the Ugalla Ecosystem, went as far as defining indicators for the SO and some of the IRs.

Reading through the assessment form (Annex 7) that participants comp ete , t conclusion is that the workshop objectives were achieved (lowest grading was 80%). Participants expressed a high level of satisfaction with the workshop, reporting that they learned a great deal about the major concepts covered throughout the three days. When asked about what parts of the workshop they would eliminate, the majority answered none, although a couple mentioned that they would eliminate some of the exercises and the summaries of the day (waste of time). Most participants wanted more time to cover the workshop topic, especially with regards to the PMPs. In summary, participants expressed that they have acquired knowledge about all sessions included in the workshop agenda. The conclusion is that the workshop really contributed to improving the participants capacity to understand the need and relevance of Performance Monitoring.

A set of bibliography lists distributed to participants (with most of the references displayed for consultation during the workshop) can be found in Annex 8