

Planning, monitoring and evaluation in complex social situations



Colophon

This document reports on the process entitled 'Strengthening Monitoring and evaluation in development projects that deal with complex social contexts' which was carried out within the framework of the Development Policy Review Network (DPRN) and organised by HIVA – Research Institute for Labour and Society, VVOB, Vredeseilanden and PSO. With the aim being to stimulate informed debate and discussion of issues related to the formulation and implementation of (Dutch) development policies, DPRN creates opportunities to promote an open exchange and dialogue between scientists, policymakers, development practitioners and the business sector in the Netherlands. For more information see www.DPRN.nl and www.global-connections.nl.

Contents

	Page
Introduction	2
Background to the theme	3
Activities realised	3
Contribution to the DPRN objectives	7
Reactions and evaluation	8
Reflection	9
Plan for follow-up	9
Appendix 1 – Programmes	11
Appendix 2 – List of participants	12
Appendix 3 – Overview of process output	16
Appendix 4 – Relevant literature and policy documents	17

Report on ‘Strengthening monitoring and evaluation in development projects that deal with complex social contexts’

Compiled by: Jan Van Ongevalle (HIVA) & Crisitien Temmink (PSO)

Period: January – December 2010

Responsible organisations: HIVA – Research Institute for Labour and Society, PSO Capacity Building in Developing Countries, the Flemish Office for Development Cooperation and Technical Assistance (VVOB) and Vredeseilanden/VECO

Introduction

In response to the growing demand for results and the recognition that traditional development practice has not met expectations, many donor organisations are now rethinking their policies on planning, monitoring and evaluation (PME).

Within the framework of the Development Policy Review Network (DPRN), HIVA Research Institute for Labour and Society of the Catholic University Leuven, PSO Capacity Building in Developing Countries, the Flemish Office for Development Cooperation and Technical Assistance (VVOB) and Vredeseilanden/VECO jointly explored the relevance of various alternative Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (PME) approaches such as Outcome Mapping, the Logical Framework and Most Significant Change.

This one-year exploration process was intended to generate practical lessons that can inform future PME policy and practice. This was done by addressing the following three objectives:

1. Draw systematic lessons from recent research and current practice in the field in order to develop a better understanding of the effectiveness of the logical framework approach, outcome mapping and the most significant changes to development projects that deal with complex social systems.
2. Develop a sustainable platform for discussion and exchange by development practitioners, researchers and policymakers in which they can continue to collaborate after this process has ended.
3. Develop specific policy recommendations for government ministries and development actors with regards to PME in development projects that deal with complex systems. This one-year exploration process was intended to generate practical lessons that can inform future PME policy and practice.

The process was structured around the following main activities:

- A survey of current PME policy among back donors in Belgium, Holland and Europe.
- A literature review of PME in complex situations.

- A development and review of learning histories from four organisations that have practical experience with the implementation of alternative PME approaches that are more complexity oriented.
- An online discussion forum of the use of traditional PME approaches such as the logical framework approach and alternative PME approaches such as outcome mapping.
- An international seminar with important stakeholders such as policymakers, research institutions, organisations and independent consultants, in order to draw lessons from the results of the DPRN process and formulate specific recommendations for PME policy and practice.

Background to the theme

Donor agencies and policymakers are increasingly faced with demands by their constituencies to reveal the concrete results of the funds they have invested in development programmes. Similarly, Southern stakeholders and beneficiaries increasingly expect those that implement aid programmes to be held accountable for the results they set out to achieve. The introduction of results-based management, resulting in the refining of a variety of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (PME) approaches, has been one response to meeting these demands. However, studies and evaluations highlight the fact that the critical information and learning needs of donors and policymakers, as well as those of Southern stakeholders and the change agents responsible for the implementation of aid programmes, are often not being met. Back donors still face problems as regards receiving all the necessary information about concrete results and effectiveness from the programmes they fund. Actors in the field are faced by the limited relevance of PME approaches to support essential learning processes. This is especially the case in complex programmes with unpredictable outcomes and a multitude of actors and factors that contribute to the results. Internationally, there is a growing recognition of the possible need to combine traditional PME approaches, such as the logical framework approach, with other instruments for the PME of development programmes that work in complex social contexts. Consequently, more and more people are advocating complexity-oriented PME approaches to address these challenges.

Activities and output realised

1. **Concept note:** Rethinking our traditional PME systems – Still struggling with PME

This short paper was used to introduce the DPRN process among different stakeholders. The paper outlines the need for exploring alternative PME approaches to help organisations dealing with complex situations. The paper provides a brief overview of outcome mapping and illustrates some advantages and disadvantages of OM, LFA and most significant change.

2. **Paper:** A survey of government policy for the planning, monitoring and evaluation of development programmes.

This paper provides an overview of government policy in Belgium and the Netherlands for planning, monitoring, and evaluation (PME) within the sector of international cooperation. It also provides an overview of European policy and the policy guidelines of the Development Assistance Committee of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD /DAC) for PME in international cooperation. The paper informed the policy dialogue and contributed to the formulation of recommendations for PME policy and practice.

3. **Paper:** Dealing with complex reality in planning, monitoring and evaluation – Choosing the most suitable approach for a specific context.

This paper supports the ongoing PME debate. By unpacking a number of practical challenges related to PME that we face in our often complex development programmes the paper formulates an analytical framework that can help to assess which PME approaches are suitable in which combination and for which context. This analytical framework is then used to explore a number of PME approaches in such a way that it can diversify our PME toolbox and can improve our judgement about the selection of a specific PME approach that is most suitable approach for a specific situation.

4. **Learning brief:** Summary of online discussion on the use of logical framework versus outcome mapping as PME approaches in development programmes.

This paper summarises the two discussion rounds relating to the use of the logical framework approach (LFA) versus outcome mapping (OM) that were held in the outcome mapping learning community in 2010. The discussions demonstrate the importance of clarifying ‘the intrinsic value of both the LFA and OM approach so that practitioners can determine which approach or combination of approaches is most suitable for use in their specific context. The discussion also highlighted the importance of a learning culture or a genuine interest to learn from project implementation. Such a learning culture may be a foundational condition for people to take seriously this business of determining the right approach for the right context.

Learning histories:

VVOB, VECO, ETC and TRIAS each developed a learning history about their experiences with the implementation of a specific PME approach. The learning histories of VVOB Zimbabwe and VECO Indonesia focus on their experiences with outcome mapping. ETC worked with Most Significant Change in Sri Lanka, while the learning history of TRIAS zooms in on their experiences with the logical framework as one element of their PME approach in Honduras. DPRN provided support in the development of the TRIAS learning history. The learning histories helped to ground the debate around alternative PME approaches during the DPRN process in concrete practice.

5. **Learning history review workshop in Leuven:** Drawing lessons from the learning histories: 21–22 September 2010.

During this two-day workshop, representatives from HIVA, VVOB, Vredeseilanden, and PSO reviewed the learning histories, as seen from the perspective of the organisation's head offices, and made an initial attempt to formulate recommendations for PME policy.

6. **Paper:** Learning from the implementation of outcome mapping, most significant change and logical framework. Summary of the main insights from a review of four learning histories.

This paper provides a summary of the main findings from the review of the four learning histories. Based on these insights the paper also formulates a number of PME policy recommendations that relate to complex development programmes.

7. International seminar in The Hague

The various results from the PME process were presented during this seminar which was held on 10 November 2010 in The Hague. At the same time, the seminar provided a forum for different stakeholders (i.e. policymakers, NGOs, academics, consultants, practitioners) in the DPRN process to formulate specific recommendations for PME policy and practice based on the lessons that were drawn from the DPRN-PME process.

8. **Action plan** for continued collaborative action after the DPRN process:

The DPRN process has successfully linked with a number of similar initiatives that will perpetuate the policy dialogue process initiated by the DPRN. An overview is given below:

- *OM effectiveness working group* on the Outcome Mapping Learning Community which will coordinate a study on the effectiveness of outcome mapping with a view to drawing recommendations for PME policy and practice. (2011-2013)
- The PSO Thematic learning programme on alternative PME approaches for complex social situations with 11 Dutch partners will continue until mid 2012. Through its engagement with DPRN the TLP will also build in a focus area on PME policy (2010-2012).
- DPRN partners, VVOB, Vredeseilanden, Coprogram and HIVA have started consultations to continue a similar process in Belgium. (2011).

Results

The various process activities have contributed to the debate about the need for alternative PME approaches when dealing with complex social situations. This is demonstrated by the various fora in which the DPRN-PME process was mentioned, such as:

- MandEnews website: <http://mande.co.uk/2010/coming-events/conferences/seminar-complexity-oriented-planning-monitoring-and-evaluation-pme-from-alternative-to-mainstream/>
- More than 500 downloads of the discussion summaries on OM and LFA on the Outcome mapping learning community: <http://outcomemapping.ca/resource/resource.php?id=304>
- More than 100 participants at the international seminar of 10 November 2010.

The various outputs of the DPRN process have not only been able to feed the policy dialogue on PME but have also helped practitioners and organisations improve their PME practice. This was demonstrated by the actions of the representatives from the head offices of the organisations who developed learning histories to develop a better understanding and appreciation of the value of alternative PME approaches and their willingness to explore ways to continue the PME process once DPRN has come to an end.

Furthermore, the DPRN–PME process resulted in some concrete and sometimes unexpected findings, as illustrated below:

What is going wrong with our PME practice?

- The ongoing focus on result-based management is generally characterised by a linear planning logic with an emphasis on measurable results at an often overambitious impact level. This has methodological implications as evidenced by the continued hegemony of the logical framework approach which, in itself, does not help organisations to set up learning-centred PME systems.
- The resulting PME frameworks are generally oriented towards accountability instead of learning and are therefore less useful when it comes to dealing with complex development processes where ongoing learning is essential for coping with unpredictable outcomes.
- There seems to be a lack of genuine dialogue and trust between donors and funded organisations and an increasing competition for funds.
- We are sometimes asked to aggregate results that cannot be aggregated, e.g. aggregating impact across a range of work, carried out by different organisations in different sectors, in different countries. The result can be painful, and in one participant's words: *"If you ask a stupid question, you get a stupid answer!"*.

What do we learn from organisations that are trying to improve their PME practice?

- No PME system by itself can guarantee that learning will take place. The key to a learning-centred PME system is a 'learning culture' in the organisation. It requires people who are genuinely seeking to customise their PME system in such a way that it helps them to learn about their own adaptive capacity and the results they achieve.
- PME systems characterised by methodological diversity can help organisations to deal with complex dimensions of social change. Some of the cases discussed during the seminar used a combination of outcome mapping, most significant change and logical framework. This helped them to monitor changes in behaviour, and attitudes on the one hand, and to develop donor reports according to the indicators of their logframe on the other hand.
- We also learned that, within the current policy environment, organisations have more space at operational level to apply different PME approaches than is often assumed.
- Developing an actor centred theory of change is an essential step in the development of a learning centred PME system because it places the people or actors involved in the programme at the heart of the PME activities.

Contribution to the DPRN objectives

Stimulating informed debate

Stimulating informed debate has been one of the major contributions of the DPRN process. The various preparatory papers on PME policy and PME approaches and the analysis of PME practice through the learning histories contributed to a debate that was based on verifiable facts instead of mere assumptions.

Involvement of relevant partners

The process enjoyed active participation by the NGOs and the academic sector. Two NGOs, one semi-governmental organisation, two membership organisations and an academic institution made up the coordinating team of the DPRN process. This constituted a rich mix of different organisations which could bring varied experiences to the process. The international seminar, in particular, provided an excellent opportunity to draw a large number of stakeholders into the process. These were predominantly from the NGO sector. Of the 101 participants to the seminar, there were 9 participants from the academic sector (9%), 10 independent consultants (10%), 1 government representative (1%) and 81 participants from the NGO sector (80%). As shown by the figures, the involvement of government representatives was limited. A possible explanation is that policymakers may not be too enthusiastic about going to public events at which their own policies may be questioned. In the future it might be necessary to organise specific activities that are less public and that provide a safe environment for policymakers to engage with the topic.

Relevance for policy and practice

An important outcome of the DPRN process is the formulation of specific recommendations for PME policy and practice. It is interesting to note that recommendations were not only formulated for policymakers but also for organisations based in practice. This illustrates the fact that both stakeholders are responsible for improving PME practice. Below we give an overview of the main recommendations that were formulated for PME policy and practice.

Recommendations for policymakers:

- Make organisations accountable for their learning.
- Prioritise an open dialogue about the problem of impact.
- Avoid imposing one rigid format for PME.
- Avoid an overload of procedures and guidelines for funding.
- Ask organisations to justify their PME approach on the basis of their actor centred theory of change.
- Develop internal capacity around complexity oriented PME methodologies.
- Develop a learning relationship with organisations that receive support.
- Support experimentation with alternative PME approaches (e.g. PSO/TLP action research).

Recommendations for NGOs

- Stimulate critical dialogue with policymakers about the relevance and feasibility of long-term detailed planning.
- Utilize the available space to implement alternative PME approaches more effectively.

- Northern NGOs should also lead by example in their PME demands towards their Southern partners.
- Showcase successful development results that were obtained through a variety of alternative PME approaches.

Enhancing cooperation and synergy

Synergies have been established in various ways during this DPRN–PME process. Firstly, researchers and practitioners worked together to explore alternative PME approaches. The development and review of the learning histories is a good example of this collaboration. This has also resulted in policy recommendations that are based on research and practice. We therefore hope that these recommendations are more convincing for policymakers both in government and in senior management of organisations. Secondly, the DPRN–PME process was able to join forces with the PSO thematic learning programme that implements action research into alternative PME approaches for complex social situations. Through the influence of the DPRN process, the thematic learning programme will also adopt a policy focus. Thirdly, following the results from the DPRN process, a working group has been established on the outcome mapping learning community to carry out research on the effectiveness of outcome mapping. Finally, the DPRN process has also contributed to an informal network of Belgian organisations who are exploring the possibilities to continue a similar process in Belgium.

Reactions and evaluation

101 people participated in the international seminar of 4 November. Some of the participants' reactions during and after the seminar are listed below:

Aspects appreciated by the participants ('tops'):

- 'I do not feel so lonely and ignorant anymore and I know now there are people out there I can talk to and ask for help.'
- 'I'm glad though to hear among other participants that we share the same (PME) challenges ...'
- 'Some concepts are helpful to compliment my professional toolbox.'
- 'Some informal contacts are very useful.'
- 'Dealing with human rights & development issues, working with partners in the South requires very variable, suitable PME strategies, so this helps.'

Suggestions for improvement ('tips'):

- 'Hardly had time to meet or talk during such a short seminar.'
- 'The required level of knowledge of methods was somewhat on the high side.'
- 'Don't take for granted that your audience understands all the acronyms and terminology. A list of those with the handouts would be useful'
- 'I would suggest reducing the number of presentations and retaining a smaller number of more in-depth presentations.'

Reflection

The DPRN PME process has been able to provide a platform for stakeholders in the international development sector to explore current PME policy and practice. This has resulted in practical insights concerning the limitations of traditional PME approaches such as the logical framework in dealing with complex processes of social change. The learning histories which resulted in specific lessons about the effectiveness of alternative PME approaches, such as outcome mapping and most significant change together with the background papers, were able to feed the public dialogue about PME. This public dialogue resulted in specific recommendations for policymakers and practitioners in terms of PME.

The fact that PME is high on the agenda of donor agencies and NGOs in the face of an increasing demand for results has contributed to the success of this DPRN process. The significant interest in alternative PME approaches across the development sector resulted in different organisations investing considerable effort towards the success of the DPRN process.

Time was a challenge during this DPRN process. Many organisations were busy developing their subsidy proposals for the next funding cycle. As a result it was not always easy for participating organisations to find the time to participate in the various activities of the DPRN process. It was therefore difficult to realise ongoing collective reflection on the various steps and outputs of the process. Linking the DPRN process with the PSO thematic learning programme on alternative PME approaches enabled various organisations to be involved in the DPRN process without having to invest extra time.

The intersectoral cooperation between development organisations, policymakers and academics has allowed the different stakeholders to express their views on alternative PME approaches based on specific experiences from PME practice (i.e. learning histories) and background papers that were developed during the DPRN process. This formed the basis of a collaborative learning process that resulted in more balanced and practical recommendations for improving PME policy and practice. The synergy that developed between the various actors also led to future initiatives that will take the work of this DPRN process further (see below for an overview of these follow-up activities).

Plan for follow up

The dialogue about alternative complexity-oriented PME approaches will continue through the follow-up activities listed below (these are the same initiatives that were listed under point 9 above):

- *OM effectiveness working group* on the Outcome Mapping Learning Community that will coordinate a study on the effectiveness of outcome mapping with a view to drawing up recommendations for PME policy and practice. (2011–2013)

- The PSO Thematic learning programme on alternative PME approaches for complex social situations with 11 Dutch partners will continue until mid 2012. Through its engagement with DPRN the TLP will also build in a focus area on PME policy (2010–2012).
- DPRN partners, VVOB, Vredeseilanden, Coprogram and HIVA have started consultations to continue a similar process in Belgium. (2011).

Appendix 1– Programmes

International Seminar 10 November, The Hague: Complexity-oriented Planning, Monitoring & Evaluation: from alternative to mainstream?				
13.30–14.00	Arrival and tea/coffee			
14.00–14.10	Welcome & objectives	Welcome, DPRN presentation, programme	Miriam Ros (DPRN)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Give background of the process. – State main objectives of the seminar. – Clarify link between research, practice and policy and make it clear that the process is aimed at policymakers in government and organisations, and practitioners.
14.10–14.30	Keynote lecture	Setting the stage: International developments in policy positions of back-donors regarding PME	Nigel Simister (Intrac)	What is the background of the discussion about policy frameworks that are complexity-compatible? What do we know about policy frameworks <i>outside</i> Belgium and Netherlands.
14.30–14.45	Example case	Testimony from the learning history of VVOB	Mqapsi (VVOB)	Provide real life experience with alternative approaches towards PME focusing both on strengths and on weaknesses. The aim is to show that methodological diversity (i.e. use of OM and LFA) can be a real strength when dealing with complex processes.
14.45–15.05	Presentation on the basis of working paper and learning histories	PME policy debate in Belgium and Netherlands: Emerging issues from the implementation of alternative PME approaches, and reflection on PME policies in the low countries Presentation of statements!	Jan Van Ongevalle (HIVA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Gain an insight into the current state of affairs pertaining policy for PME. – Present the main findings of the learning histories and some teasing (or controversial) statements in relation to PME policy that can help people to brainstorm and discuss during the workshops of the next sessions.
	Workshops	<p>Workshop 1: Discussion of three scenarios for PME policy.</p> <p>Workshop 2: Creation of space to experiment: Do NGOs have more space to use alternative PME approaches than often assumed?</p> <p>Workshop 3: What consequences does a complexity view on social change have for PME?</p>		Allow participants to formulate some concrete policy recommendations that are supported by the insights and data from the learning histories and which they find feasible from their own professional perspective.
16.00–17.00	Panel discussion	Panel discussion	policy makers, reference group members and practitioners	Allow panellists to engage in debate on the insights from the workshops and the issue of PME policy.
17.00	Drinks & bites			

Appendix 2 – List of participants International Seminar 10 November, The Hague

	Name	Organisation	Sector
1.	Alexaki, N. (Nancy)	NUFFIC	practice
2.	Alpenidze, I. (Irma)	MDF	private sector
3.	Ani, A. (Amaka)	Equalinrights	practice
4.	Arkesteijn, M.C.M. (Marlèn)	Capturing Development	private sector
5.	Ascoly, N. (Nina)	Friends of the Earth International	practice
6.	Ayifli, F. (Fred)	Equalinrights	practice
7.	Bandyopadhyay, K.K. (Kaustuv Kanti)	PRIA International	practice
8.	Berg, S. van den (Simon)	War Trauma Foundation	practice
9.	Blaauw, M. (Margriet)	WAR Child Nederland	practice
10.	Blank, L. (Linda)	CDP	private sector
11.	Bleek, G. van (Greta)	Oxfam Novib	practice
12.	Blommestein, N. (Nele)	NCDO	practice
13.	Boonchuey, A. (Anong)	War Trauma Foundation	practice
14.	Borges, R. (Rosa)	NUFFIC	practice
15.	Bosma, R. (Roel)	Wageningen Universiteit	science
16.	Briggs, B. (Beatrice)	Instituto Internacional de Facilitación y Cambio, S.C.	private sector
17.	Brink, L. van (Liesbeth)	Wetlands International	practice
18.	Burke, E. (Erick)	Friends of the Earth International	practice
19.	Cnossen, J. (Jitske)	Themis	private sector
20.	Custers, C. (Cecile)	Wageningen Universiteit	science
21.	Damme, W. van (Wouter)	VVOB	practice
22.	Deprez, S. (Steff)	VREDESEILANDEN	practice
23.	Duning, B. (Bertiene)	Kwink Groep BV	private sector
24.	Dütting, G.		other
25.	Eraly, D. (Debbie)	Groenhart vzw	practice
26.	Es, M. van (Marjan)	HIVOS	practice
27.	Fon, B. (Bruno)	Diaspora Forum for Development (DFD)	practice

28.	Foppen, H. (Hester)	ICCO	practice
29.	Fyles, R. (Rex)	Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ottawa	science
30.	Ghebtsawi, T. (Terhas)	Public Health Consultant	private sector
31.	Gosses, A. (Antoinette)	PSO	practice
32.	Griede, E. (Elise)	WAR Child Nederland	practice
33.	Guri, B. (Bern)	ETC Compas	private sector
34.	Hartog, K. (Kim)	SOS-Kinderdorpen	practice
35.	Hermans, L. (Leon)	Delft University of Technology	science
36.	Hiemstra, W. (Wim)	ETC Foundation	private sector
37.	Ho, W. (Wenny)	Action Aid International	practice
38.	Holtrop, T. (Tjitske)		other
39.	Houdijk, M. (Margreet)	Cordaid	practice
40.	Huyse, H. (Huib)	HIVA	science
41.	Jans, V. (Valérie)	SOS-Kinderdorpen	practice
42.	Joris, E. (Eric)	DMOS-COMIDE	practice
43.	Kahandawa, K.A.J. (Kaha)	ETC Compas	private sector
44.	Kamphof, P. (Peter)	Tear	practice
45.	Kloosterman, J. (Jeanette)	Oxfam Novib	practice
46.	Komives, K. (Kristin)	ISEAL Alliance	practice
47.	Koningsbrugge, W.H.M. van (Wilhelmina)	Trainer	private sector
48.	Korsten, E. (Eric)	IMPACT	private sector
49.	Kouwenhoven, W. (Wim)	CIS-VU	science
50.	Laan, A. van der (Anita)	SNV	practice
51.	Lange, P. de (Piet)	Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken	policy
52.	Langeler, B. (Betty)	Stichting Dark & Light	practice
53.	Maarse, A. (Anneke)	PSO	practice
54.	Macfarlane, I.G. (Ian)	CIS-VU	science
55.	Marchand, R.P. (Ron)	Medisch Comité Nederland-Vietnam	practice
56.	Mark, I. van der (Iris)	Antares Foundation	practice
57.	Melis, T. (Tineke)	CIS-VU	science

58.	Monchy, C. de (Charles)	De Monchy & Partners	private sector
59.	Mulder, A. (Arjen)	Oxfam Novib	practice
60.	Niemann, L. (Ludger)	Oxfam Novib	practice
61.	Noordergraaf, B. (Bert)	ICCO&Kerk in Actie	practice
62.	Obure, J.O. (Jerim Otieno)	Consultant	private sector
63.	Olivier, S. (Suzanne)	Social Trade Organisation (STRO)	practice
64.	Ommeren, T. van (Trudy)	Oxfam Novib	practice
65.	Ongevalle, J. van (Jan)	HIVA	science
66.	Pavicic, M. (Michael)	Mensen met een Missie	practice
67.	Piek, J.G. (Johanna Getruida)		other
68.	Pronk, F. (Froukje)	Stichting Marokko Fonds	practice
69.	Punt, W. (Wievenlien)	Leprastichting	practice
70.	Raaphorst, W. (Wendy)	Theatre Embassy	practice
71.	Reedijk, H. (Heleen)	MDF	private sector
72.	Riet, H. van 't (Hilda)	Cordaid	practice
73.	Rijneveld, W. (Wouter)	Stichting Woord en Daad	practice
74.	Roefs, M. (Marlene)	SNV	practice
75.	Ros – Tonen, M. (Mirjam)	Universiteit van Amsterdam	science
76.	Scheers, G. (Goele)	European Centre for Conflict Prevention	private sector
77.	Schot, S. (Sander)	Stichting Dark & Light	practice
78.	Schuurmans, A. (Akke)	PSO	practice
79.	Servaas, M.L. (Maurits Lukas)	ICCO	practice
80.	Sibanda, M. (Mqaphelisi)	VVOB	practice
81.	Silva Wells, C. da (Carmen)	IRC International Water & San.Centre	practice
82.	Simister, N. (Nigel)	INTRAC	private sector
83.	Skinner, R. (Reinhard)	Urban Management & Development Ass. (UMBA) b.v.	private sector
84.	Soal, S. (Sue)	CDRA	practice
85.	Steenbergen, V. (Victor)	Equalinrights	practice
86.	Stiefelhagen, R. (Ria)	War Trauma Foundation	practice
87.	Stolp, A. (Annemarie)	HIVOS	practice
88.	Tanis, M. (Maryse)	Stichting Woord en Daad	practice

89.	Temmink, C. (Cristien)	PSO	practice
90.	Ton, P. (Peter)	Consultant	private sector
91.	Van Ongevalle Jan	HIVA	science
92.	Vasani, D. (Dolar)	KNCV Tuberculosis Foundation	practice
93.	Veldman, M. (Marjolein)	Stichting Marokko Fonds	practice
94.	Verduijn, T. (Tim)	GZB	practice
95.	Vervisch, T. (Thomas)	TRIAS vzw	practice
96.	Vorst, G.J.M. van der (Frits)	HealthNet-TPO	practice
97.	Wilde, J. de (Jeroen)	VVOB	practice
98.	Wortel, E. (Erica)	Wortel Project & Interin Management	private sector
99.	Wuite, R. (Rosemarie)	Niza	practice
100.	Zorge, R. van (Ruth)	Rutgers Nisso Group	practice
101.	Zwanenburg, M. (Martin)	NEDWORC Association	private sector

Appendix 3 – Overview of process output

1. **Concept note:** [Rethinking our traditional PME systems – Still struggling with PME](#)
2. **Paper:** [A survey of Government Policy for the planning, monitoring and evaluation of development programmes.](#)
3. **Paper:** [Dealing with complex reality in planning, monitoring and evaluation – Choosing the most suitable approach for a specific context.](#)
4. **Learning brief:** [Summary of online discussion around the use of logical framework versus outcome mapping as PME approaches in development programmes.](#)
5. **Learning history:** [Lessons learned from the TRIAS Planning Monitoring and Evaluation System in Honduras.](#)
6. **Paper:** [Learning from the implementation of outcome mapping, most significant change and logical framework. Summary of the main insights from a review of four learning histories.](#)
7. **Report** [of the International seminar in Den Hague of 10 November 2010: Complexity-oriented Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation \(PME\) – From alternative to mainstream?](#)
8. **Action plan** for continued collaborative action after the DPRN process.

Appendix 4 – Relevant literature and policy documents

- Earl, S. and Carden, F. (2003). Learning from complexity: the International Development Research Centre's experience with Outcome Mapping. In Pettit, J., Roper, L., and Eade, D. (eds.), *Development and the Learning Organisation, Development in Practice Readers*, Oxfam GB. http://www.idrc.ca/en/ev-62651-201-1-DO_TOPIC.html.
- Earl, S., Carden, F., and Smutylo, T. (2001). *Outcome Mapping: Building learning and reflection into development programs*. Ottawa: International Development Research Centre (IDRC).
- European Commission (2009). *Non-State Actors and Local Authorities in Development, Restricted Call for Proposals, Guidelines for Grant Applications*. http://www.vvsg.be/Internationaal/Noord-Zuid/Wettelijk_kader/Documents/NSA-LA%2020091202%20Guidelines%20for%20grant%20applicants.pdf
- Federale overheidsdienst Buitenlandse zaken, Buitenlandse handel en ontwikkelings samenwerking (2010). *Koninklijk besluit houdende de oprichting van een dienst Bijzondere Evaluatie van de Internationale Samenwerking. 25 FEBRUARY 2010*. <http://reflex.raadvst-consetat.be/refLex/pdf/Mbbs/2010/03/15/115930.pdf>
- Hummelbrunner, R. (2010). Beyond Logframe: Critique, variations and alternatives. In Nobuko Fujita (ed.), *Beyond Logframe; Using Systems Concepts in Evaluation* (pp. 1–33), the Foundation for Advanced Studies on International Development, Tokyo, Japan;
- IOB (2009). *Evaluatiebeleid en richtlijnen voor evaluatie*, <http://www.minbuza.nl/dsresource?objectid=buzabeheer:139652&type=org>
- OECD/DAC (2009). *Better Aid, Civil Society and Aid Effectiveness, Findings, Recommendations and Good Practice*, http://www.oecd.org/document/16/0,3343,en_2649_33721_41726352_1_1_1_1,00.html
- OECD/DAC (2009). *Managing Aid, Practices of DAC member countries*, <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/58/29/42903202.pdf>
- Simister, N and Smith, R. (2010). *Monitoring and Evaluating Capacity Building: Is it really that difficult?* Praxis Paper 23, INTRAC. http://www.efc.be/CapacityBuilding/Documents/Praxis_Paper_23_Monitoring_and_Evaluating_Capacity_Building_is_it_really_that_difficult.pdf

