



# Planning, monitoring and evaluation in complex social situations



*Working paper (November 2010)*

**A survey of Government Policy for the planning, monitoring and evaluation of development programmes**

*Jan Van Ongevalle, Huib Huyse and Renske Aarnoudse (HIVA, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven)*



## Colophon



This working paper is written for the process ‘Strengthening monitoring and evaluation in development projects that deal with complex social contexts’ (<http://pme.globalconnections.nl/>), which is being carried out within the framework of the Development Policy Review Network (DPRN) and organised by HIVA – the Research Institute for Labour and Society of the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven (KUL), the Flemish Office for Development Cooperation and Technical Assistance (VVOB), VECO – Vredeseilanden, and PSO Capacity Building in Developing Countries. With a view to stimulating informed debate and discussion of issues related to the formulation and implementation of (Dutch) development policies, DPRN creates opportunities to promote open exchange and dialogue between scientists, policymakers, development practitioners, and the business sector in the Netherlands and Flanders. For more information see [www.DPRN.nl](http://www.DPRN.nl) and [www.globalconnections.nl](http://www.globalconnections.nl)

## Contents

	Page
<b>Acronyms</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Belgium</b>	<b>4</b>
Belgian Directorate-General of Development Cooperation (DGD)	4
Special Evaluation Unit ('dienst bijzondere evaluatie') Belgium	6
Flanders International Cooperation Agency (VAIS)	8
<b>The Netherlands</b>	<b>8</b>
Netherlands Directorate-General of Development Cooperation (DGIS)	8
Policy and Operations Evaluation Department (IOB), The Netherlands	9
<b>OECD/DAC</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>European Commission</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Sources</b>	<b>15</b>

## Acronyms

BTC	Belgian Technical Co-operation Agency
DGD	Belgian Directorate-General of Development Cooperation
DGIS	Netherlands Directorate-General of Development Cooperation of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs
DSO	Directorate of Social Development of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
IACD	Independent Advisory Committee on Development Impact
IOB	Policy and Operations Evaluation Department of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs
MFS	Dutch Co-financing System ('medefinancieringsstelsel')
NGO	Non Governmental Organisation
OECD /DAC	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development/Development Assistance Committee
PME	Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation
SMART	Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, Time
VAIS	Flanders International Cooperation Agency
VVOB	Flemish Office for Development Cooperation and Technical Assistance

## Introduction

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. 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 is also given. It is based on a review of policy documents, communication, and operational guidelines of these actors. This working paper will be used during an international seminar in November 2010 where various organisations and policy makers will be given an opportunity to explore the advantages and challenges of different PM&E methods such as the logical framework approach, outcome mapping and most significant change. This exploration will be done on the basis of learning histories of development programmes that implement these methods and the experiences of the participants to the workshop. It is hoped that this process will strengthen both PM&E policy and practice.

Public-policy documents show that the Belgian and Dutch governments, OECD-DAC, and the European Union all encourage development agencies to use logical frameworks to specify a programme's result chain in their funding applications. This logical framework then provides a basis for the monitoring of progress and results. While there are many variations of the logframe and the process through which it should be implemented, the basic building blocks remain largely the same. After several decades of use the logframe's position as the exclusive instrument for development planning, monitoring and evaluation is no longer uncontested. An alternative and complementary toolbox is evolving. Policymakers in donor agencies and governments are confronted with the question of how to respond to this development. At the same time, development agencies wishing to experiment with alternative PME systems are confronted with the question of whether donors will accept their funding proposals if they are not based entirely on the logframe.

This working paper originates from the finding that the current policies of back-donors and governments concerning PME are not always well developed and documented, and are therefore open for interpretation. This leaves development agencies, wishing to apply for funding, with unclear margins regarding PME innovation and experimentation.

A first review of policy documents and legal frameworks reveals that, overall; there might be more room for innovation and experimentation than is generally assumed. The Dutch government, for example, has tried to promote the learning dimension of M&E within its 'Customised' (Maatgesneden) monitoring approach and finances a large-scale action-research programme around alternative PME methods for capacity development. Also in Belgium, the attitude towards PME is gradually changing; the logframe is no longer seen as the ideal method to be applied in all situations. Basically, the logical framework is still the mainstream PME methodology, but there seem to be some openings for organisations to start using other methods, although some reservation remains.

In the following sections the legal framework and the funding guidelines of the various back-donors and governments are examined, and an analysis of their current position in the PME debate is given (in as far this could be re-constructed from secondary sources).

This working paper is work in progress and will be complemented with insights from the DPRN seminar on 10 November.

## Belgium

### **Belgian Directorate-General of Development Cooperation (DGD)**

#### *Legal framework and funding guidelines*

The Directorate-General of Development Cooperation (DGD) is responsible for the various aspects of Belgian development cooperation. Although DGD itself does not implement the interventions that it finances or co-finances, it has a political responsibility as a donor institution. DGD has a duty to ensure that projects and programmes, and their results, are monitored, as monitoring is a part of the management of the interventions that are implemented by the partners of DGD.

DGD uses the following **OECD /DAC definition of monitoring**:

- a continuing function that uses the systematic collection of data;
- on an ongoing development;
- using specified indicators;
- to provide the management and main stakeholders with indications of the extent of progress and the achievement of objectives and progress in the use of allocated funds.

While existing legal frameworks do not explicitly refer to a specific PME method, some of the terminology and concepts used in guiding documents clearly assume logical-linear-planning models such as the logical framework. At an operational level this assumption can be observed for indirect and bilateral aid in the DGD requirements to design detailed plans for 3 to 6 years, the steering towards results-based management with tangible results at beneficiary level, and the promotion of SMART<sup>1</sup> indicators. For the indirect-aid actors, DGD has also been putting forward planning and reporting templates in a logframe model as part of the funding guidelines. However, these procedures and guidelines have not prevented some indirect actors from experimenting with alternative PME approaches at lower programming levels. Also the bilateral-aid agency, Belgian Technical Co-operation Agency (BTC), is currently piloting alternative approaches in a few programmes, as described below.

**The Department for Indirect Aid (non-governmental programmes, D3):** In the subsidy guidelines for non-governmental programmes, an extensive overview is given of all the information that Non Governmental Organisations (NGOs) or Universities should provide when applying for subsidies from DGD. One section deals with ‘accountability and the verification of subsidies’; another section covers ‘financial norms and administrative guidelines’. Progress-and-results reports should predominantly reflect the objectives and set goals and the balance between expected and obtained results. Several references make

---

<sup>1</sup> SMART stands for:

- Specific – Objectives should specify what you want to achieve.
- Measurable – You should be able to measure whether you are meeting the objectives or not.
- Achievable – Are the objectives you set achievable?
- Realistic – Can you achieve the objectives with the resources you have?
- Time – When do you want to achieve the set objectives?

clear that the report 'should be in line with the results and activities as laid down in the logical framework.'

**The Department for Direct Aid (Governmental programmes, D1):** In the contractual agreement between the Belgian state and BTC, no requirement is specified that makes use of the logical framework mandatory PME methodology. However, since DGD plays a role in the first phases of the programme cycle, initial programme designs tend to be developed as logframes. Subsequent identification and formulation work by BTC builds on these logframes. While the BTC is using the logical framework as the standard PME tool in their programmes, they have recently (March 2010) piloted outcome mapping in selected programmes in Mali, Rwanda, and Burundi. DGD has given this experimentation their approval.

#### *Current position on the PME debate*

There are some indications that DGD has an interest in exploring alternative PME methodologies that can strengthen results-based management and at the same time improve the learning dimension at programme level. This interest is demonstrated by their participation in outcome-mapping training workshops (for example; the outcome-mapping workshop of 26 May 2010 organised by Vredeseilanden<sup>2</sup>, and participation in a working group with NGOs and research institutions to explore alternative PME methods such as outcome mapping that can complement the logical framework approach<sup>3</sup>).

It can also be noted that DGD has given the green light to various non-governmental organisations such as Vredeseilanden and semi-governmental organisations such as the Flemish Office for Development Cooperation and Technical Assistance (VVOB) to implement outcome mapping as a PME system at operational level. Both organisations are still required to report progress towards the indicators of intermediate-result areas and the specific objectives as stated in the logical framework that could be seen as the PME system at strategic level. However, no formal communication or stance towards the use of alternative PME approaches has been identified, and organisations have to negotiate individually with DGD to find out what they can and cannot do.

#### **Special Evaluation Unit ('dienst bijzondere evaluatie') Belgium**

##### *Legal framework*

The Special Development Cooperation Evaluation Unit is tasked with the evaluation of all activities of the Federal State that are recognised as official development assistance. The monitoring and evaluation department of the DGD has been integrated within the special evaluation unit. Every year this unit draws up a programme of priorities in consultation with all parties concerned and drafts an annual report for submission to the Minister for Development Cooperation on the findings and lessons to be learned from the evaluations. The Minister submits this report to Parliament.

The special evaluation unit works according to the criteria formulated by the OECD/DAC (see below). This situation is mentioned explicitly in the legislation concerning the unit.

---

<sup>2</sup> Internal DGD report on outcome mapping workshop.

<sup>3</sup> Coprogram, the Flemish Federation of NGOs for Development Cooperation, coordinates the working group on Results Based Management, see [www.coprogram.be](http://www.coprogram.be).

*“FEBRUARY '25 2010. – Royal Decree pertaining to the establishment of a Special Evaluation Unit of the International Cooperation*

*§ 2. Subject to the provisions of this Decree, the Special Evaluation Unit shall perform its activities in conformity with the principles and standards approved by the Member States of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), and published as an official document by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development.”*

The Special Evaluation Unit uses the following **OECD/DAC definition of evaluation**:

- a systematic, maximally objective assessment;
- of an on-going or completed project, programme or policy;
- and of its design, implementation, and results;
- with the aim of determining the relevance and fulfilment of objectives, development efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability.

Specific evaluation approaches are not prescribed but the need that it is often necessary to combine “quantitative and qualitative methods because of the specific nature of development cooperation” (§37) is highlighted. The importance of evaluating the impact of a project or programme, beyond the direct outputs, is explicitly stated. Impact is referred to as “effects on the social, economic, ecological and other development indicators that result from the activities of the intervention”. Both, expected and unexpected results should be looked at and evaluations should describe positive and negative impact of external factors such as changes in policy or general economic and political circumstances (§35).

While the above evaluation guidelines are not methodologically prescriptive, their reference to the need for measurable results at broader impact level and the expectation that causal links between intervention activities and results will be traced during evaluations will have consequences for planning and monitoring approaches in project and programme cycle management. It will need to be seen how these guiding principles influence the strategic direction of development organisations when they are confronted with the choice between focussing on measurable and predictable results within their sphere of control (e.g. infrastructure development or direct service delivery) or focussing on the more unpredictable results to which they can only contribute but which are eventually the responsibility of the local actors (e.g. capacity development or improved service delivery by local actors). This may be an interesting point of discussion during the DPRN policy dialogue process on alternative approaches of PME.

#### *Current position on PME debate*

While the special evaluation unit does not make the use of the logical framework as an evaluation instrument a requirement, their terms of reference for evaluations often refer to the logical-framework of programmes that are evaluated.

At the same time, the special evaluation unit also tries to follow the current debate on alternative PME approaches. This endeavour is illustrated by a special edition of the Unit’s internal newsletter (E-valuator, Special Evaluation Unit, 2009) that featured the advantages and disadvantages of outcome mapping over the logical-framework approach. On the basis of these discussions, the special evaluation unit seems to recognise that outcome mapping may be suitable for capacity-development programmes, because the methodology

stimulates the participation of partners in PME and places special emphasis on learning. On the other hand the unit raises questions about the fact that outcome mapping does not monitor results at the level of the ultimate beneficiaries. In addition there is a concern that the strong emphasis on learning may be less suitable for satisfying accountability needs. Furthermore, the outcome-mapping definition of *outcomes* as *changes in the behaviour of boundary partners* is seen as too narrow. Finally, it is felt that there is still too little research-based evidence about the advantages of outcome mapping (*ibid*).

In general the special evaluation unit still shows considerable reservation towards alternative PME systems. In a recent case, experimentation with outcome mapping was discouraged, as the report of the special evaluation unit pertaining to the 2009 external evaluation of the projects of BTC illustrates. The special evaluation unit advised BTC to 'put more effort into simplifying the procedures for project formulation instead of experimenting with new instruments such as outcome mapping' (special evaluation unit, 2010). The unit is concerned that the use of different PME systems could result in unnecessary confusion. This attitude seems to be at odds with an external evaluation of 2008 that recommended more methodological diversity for PME in response to the often complex contexts of the BTC projects.

## **Flanders International Cooperation Agency (VAIS)**

### *Legal framework and funding guidelines*

Organisations can request subsidies from VAIS for their development programmes. The document that provides information on the application procedure contains specific guidelines that seek to promote the integral quality assurance of the subsidised programmes (Guidelines 2010, p. 9). Some of the guidelines related to monitoring and evaluation are listed below:

*"The Flemish government will pursue total quality management. This can be interpreted as a clear choice for:*

- I. Systematic dialogue with different actors for efficient implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of policy;*
- II. Implementing internal and external evaluations;*
- III. A focus on results, effects, and impacts (rather than a focus on input, well-written application dossiers, logical frameworks,...);*
- IV. Refinement of the use of logical frameworks (=recognition of the limitations of the instrument."*

### *Current position of the PME debate*

While the funding-application guidelines explicitly state that the limitations of the logical framework are recognised (see guideline 4 above), VAIS still uses the logframe as the mainstream methodology. One of the attachments to the application form is the logframe itself, and the guidelines state that the objectives should be a detailed explanation of those presented in the logical framework. While the subsidy guidelines indicate that there is room for experimentation there are no clear guidelines on possible alternative PME methods or approaches that can be used.

## **The Netherlands**

## Netherlands Directorate-General of Development Cooperation (DGIS)

### *Legal framework and funding guidelines*

Since 2007 DGIS has implemented a new monitoring system for the organisations receiving funding from the Ministry called 'Customised (Maatgesneden) Monitoring'. Within this system organisations elaborate a *monitoring protocol* that specifies the projected results and objectives within a four-year period. The system helps organisations clarify their results chain in a logframe matrix including inputs, outputs, outcomes, and impact. The monitoring protocol also contains information on how the various aspects of the results chain will be measured by indicators and projected indicator values that could be determined by the organisations themselves. The monitoring protocols are then used as the basis for the yearly plans and annual reports to the Ministry.

The 'Customised Monitoring' system aims to give organisations the opportunity to monitor their programmes on the basis of the aspects they perceive to be the most important. The system is also supposed to give NGOs the chance to focus on creating learning opportunities. Accountability remains important, but is no longer the main goal.

External evaluations in 2008 and 2009 of the 'Customised Monitoring' system identified a number of challenges:

- While 'Customised Monitoring' has contributed to more precision about the expected results and measurable indicators, there is still little information on how these results are obtained. The story behind the numbers is not coming through in the current method of reporting.
- 'Customised Monitoring' was not seen in practice as a learning instrument by either the Ministry or the development organisations, but rather as an accountability instrument.
- The system has contributed little to drawing lessons across organisations and sharing these lessons. The monitoring system has not resulted in a decreased administrative burden. Much of the information collected in the monitoring process remains unused by the Ministry and the organisations.

For the new Co-financing System (MFS, 'medefinancieringsstelsel') 2010–2013, organisations again have to specify their results chain in a logical-framework matrix that includes outputs and outcomes with associated indicators. Organisations are asked to keep to the SMART principles as far as possible, but if they feel that their programmes are an exception then they may provide a detailed explanation why developing SMART indicators is not possible for them.

The monitoring and evaluation guidelines also require the organisations to explain how the implementation of the programme(s) will be monitored (target-group-specific method, frequency, and actors involved), taking the baseline measurement as a starting point. Furthermore, organisations are also asked to specify how the monitoring results will be used for steering and adjusting the implementation of the programme(s) where necessary. Programmes must be evaluated and the evaluation should show the extent to which the intended results have been achieved. From recent communication between the NGOs and the ministry it can be derived that the ministry is also seriously considering to make the use of control groups obligatory (DSO, 2010). It would mean evolving in the direction of Randomised Control Trials (RCT). This would have a significant impact on the kind of

objectives that NGOs can set themselves because the results of their work would have to be measurable through quasi-experimental PME designs.

#### *Current position on the PME debate*

DGIS currently provides funding to PSO<sup>4</sup> in support of a large-scale action research in which 15 Dutch organisations explore the use of alternative PME methodologies in complex contexts. These methodologies include outcome mapping, most significant change, sensemaker, and participative organisational-assessment tools. The research will run for three years (2010–2012) and seeks to draw lessons systematically about the effectiveness of these alternative PME methods. It is a clear illustration of DGIS' interest in exploring new approaches in PME.

### **Policy and Operations Evaluation Department (IOB), the Netherlands**

#### *Legal framework*

A special department within the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs evaluates the Ministry's policies. The IOB's main concern is international development programmes. In October 2009 a report was published that examined the department's tasks and set out how these could best be implemented. In general, as it repeatedly stresses, the IOB bases its policies on the OECD/DAC guidelines. The publication entitled 'Evaluation policy and guidelines for evaluation' discusses definitions, criteria, processes, and quality control. The document refers frequently to the logical framework as a specific planning, monitoring, and evaluation tool. No alternative PME tools are mentioned.

p. 17 – evaluation criteria:

*"The evaluation criteria point towards distinct levels that are derived from the 'logical framework' or result chains derived from the logframe. Together, these evaluation criteria provide the framework under which an examiner's findings can be presented in an orderly and consistent manner."*

p. 19 – definition of impact:

*"In the more formal 'logical framework' the term impact usually refers to the highest results level."*

p. 20 – definition of relevance:

*"In the 'logical framework', relevance refers to the extent to which the activities undertaken have made a lasting contribution to the achievement of the ultimate development goal, that is its impact. [...] IOB will implement the notion of relevance in this manner."*

p. 34 – the evaluation design:

*"Most of the IOB evaluations are organised according to the guidelines for theory-based evaluation. This arrangement is also obvious because the goal is to evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of policy and policy implementation. [...]. The most common and proven method of presenting the objectives and the intervention strategy in an orderly manner is the logical framework or the (often more detailed) results chain. This*

---

<sup>4</sup> PSO is an association consisting of sixty Dutch development organisations. The association concentrates on capacity development in civil-society organisations in developing countries.

*model provides a framework for systematic data collection and the identification of indicators for systematised assessment. The model also provides a framework for determining the relationships between the different result levels.”*

## OECD/DAC

### *Guidelines on PME*

The OECD/DAC guidelines concerning PME have strongly influenced the adoption of logical–framework approaches by both the Belgian and the Dutch development agencies. This influence is not surprising, because explicit reference is made to the logical framework approach in a number of OECD/DAC publications. At the same time, the heavy reliance on the logframe is also understandable from the observation that, until recently, there were few alternatives in the development sector for logframe–based PME.

In the ‘Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management’ published by the OECD/DAC (2002), a long list of definitions is presented, all related to PME within international development. The only PME method that is mentioned specifically is the logical framework (see Box 1).

#### **Box 1. Logical framework (Logframe) according to the OECD/DAC**

*“A management tool used to improve the design of interventions, most often at the project level. The tool involves identifying strategic elements (inputs, outputs, outcomes, impact) and their causal relationships, indicators, and the assumptions or risks that may influence success and failure. The tool thus facilitates the planning, execution, and evaluation of a development intervention.”* (OECD, 2002)

Another OECD publication entitled ‘Managing Aid’ (OECD, 2005) also explicitly mentions the logical framework as a ‘useful basis for monitoring, using indicators and means of verification specified’ (see Box 2 below). The same information about monitoring is used again in a follow–up publication issued in 2009.

## Box 2. Monitoring according to the OECD/DAC

The implementation of development interventions is an integral part of the project/programme cycle, as it should be, regardless of the aid modality being used. The OECD/DAC defines *monitoring* as *a continuing function that uses the systematic collection of data on specified indicators to provide the management and main stakeholders of an ongoing development intervention with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of objectives and progress in the use of allocated funds*. Monitoring enables progress to be reviewed and corrective actions to be proposed so that the activity's objectives can be achieved. Monitoring is the responsibility of both implementing and funding organisations, but should also include the perspectives of stakeholders and beneficiaries. Logical frameworks provide a useful basis for monitoring, using the indicators and means of verification specified.

A well-designed development intervention will have clear, measurable objectives as well as indicators. Indicators measure the carrying out of specified activities, the achievement of results, and the likelihood of the achievement of the objectives. If baseline information is not already available, it may be necessary to collect it during the initial project phase in order to provide an adequate basis for the subsequent monitoring of progress. A baseline study collects data that describes and analyses socioeconomic and other conditions and trends during a particular period. The indicators set through a baseline study become the reference points for demonstrating change and the achievement of objectives. Monitoring should also extend to changes in the external environment and major assumptions underpinning the activity. (OECD 2005)

### *Current position in the PME debate*

Recent OECD publications indicate a methodological shift that recognises the importance of methodological diversity in the face of the often complex contexts that development interventions encounter. There is also a growing recognition of the necessity to base the selection of a method on a careful consideration of its suitability and effectiveness in a specific context (OECD, 2005).

In a recent publication entitled 'Civil Society and Aid Effectiveness' (OECD, 2009), OECD gives an overview of various project cases that exemplify good practice in 'managing for results and accountability'. None of these cases used the logical-framework approach, but instead implemented alternative PME methodologies such as outcome mapping and internal self-assessment and review systems. On the basis of these cases a number of recommendations have been formulated. These clearly favour methodological diversity.

*"Recommendation 10a: Adopt results-based approaches and results-monitoring mechanisms intended first and foremost as management tools to promote iterative learning and adaptation, while empowering the ultimate beneficiaries of development programmes."*

*"Recommendation 10b: Adopt a more meaningful approach to results that includes greater attention to indicators of institutional and social change and to gender-disaggregated data of importance to CSO operating as agents of change."*

The OECD/DAC publication of 2006 on good practices in capacity development also has some methodological implications as it recognises that capacity development should be seen as 'a non-linear iterative process'. One of these implications is highlighted in relation to the importance of agreeing on the desired outcomes of capacity development, both for directing

interventions and for setting benchmarks for assessing progress along the way. The study illustrates how views differ about whether formal methods such as the logical framework are the best way to secure the kind of agreement that matters in a multi-stakeholder process. Instead the study advises avoiding making the selection of methods supply-driven by the donor. Rather, 'it should be based on a considered judgement about the likely effectiveness and comparative costs of the available options' (OECD /DAC, 2006, p. 28)

## European Commission

Within the 'Non-State Actors and Local Authorities in Development' programmes non-governmental organisations can apply for subsidies from the European Commission. One of the application requirements is the submission of a fully-completed logical framework. The 'Results Oriented Monitoring' manual of the European Commission situates the logical framework clearly in the project cycle:

*"The EC has required the use of the Logical Framework Approach as part of its Project Cycle Management system since 1993. Knowledge of the principles of LFA is therefore essential for all staff involved in the design and delivery of EC projects."* (EC ROM manual, 2009, p.28).

At the same time, the manual promotes the use of the logical framework in a flexible and participatory way involving all relevant stakeholders in the discussion and reflection about the goals and activities of a project. The logframe must permit adaptation to unexpected conditions during the implementation phase. **Conclusion**

From this policy overview we can conclude that the logical framework is still very much the mainstream PME methodology that government and back-donors in Belgium, the Netherlands and Europe require for their funded programmes. This requirement is to be expected in view of the long-lasting hegemony of the logframe in the development sector – interestingly, the only sector in which this PME method has reached such an exclusive position. In the absence of real alternatives, and with various OECD /DAC publications, the World Bank, and many others advocating it as a useful basis for planning, monitoring and evaluation, the logframe became the standard throughout the whole sector.

At the same time the interest of policymakers in PME methods that are more suitable for the often complex contexts of development interventions is growing. This interest is illustrated by a growing trend towards experimentation such as the learning-oriented 'Customised' monitoring and the large-scale action-research programme around alternative PME in the Netherlands. We also see in Belgium opportunities for exploration as illustrated by the piloting of outcome mapping in a limited number of bilateral aid programmes and within PME processes at operational levels by various organisations such as VVOB and Vredeseilanden. In addition, a number of recent large-scale evaluations in Belgium (evaluation of BTC in 2008, and the evaluation of 40 NGO partnerships in 2010) have advocated the diversification of the PME toolbox.

This trend is also supported by important international studies. There are several recent OECD publications, mentioned earlier in this paper, that recognise the limitations of the

logical framework as only possible PME approach and instead recommend to select PME approaches on the basis of their usefulness and effectiveness in a specific context. More specifically related to evaluations, a recent study on the quality of DFID's evaluation reports by the International Advisory Committee on Development Impact (IACDI) advises "to experiment in order to develop new models and approaches for evaluation which are more suitable for complex development strategies" (IACD, 2009).

These developments are an indication that the hegemony of the logical framework may be shifting towards a more open attitude for methodological diversity.

The big challenge ahead for both policymakers and practitioners and researchers will be the identification of the methods that are most useful in particular contexts. There is also a need to establish whether alternative PME systems, such as outcome mapping and most significant change, are indeed complementary and sometimes better suited to complex contexts and do indeed contribute to more effective programming and the delivery of sustainable results.

## Summary Table

Belgium	
Government agency	M&E related policy
Special evaluation unit	<i>Refers to OECD/DAC</i>
Flanders International Cooperation Agency	<i>Recognises the limitation of the logical framework, but still uses it as the mainstream methodology</i>
Belgian Directorate-General of Development Cooperation (DGD)	<i>Format strongly inspired by the logical framework</i>

The Netherlands	
Government agency	M&E related policy
Policy and Operations Evaluation Department (IOB)	<i>Extensive policy document on its evaluation policies, much emphasis is laid on the logical framework</i>
Netherlands Directorate-General of Development Cooperation (DGIS)	<i>'Customised (Maatgesneden) Monitoring' in combination with the Monitoring Protocol (derivative of the Logframe) - amongst others implemented to stimulate learning opportunities</i>

International	
Government agency	M&E related policy
OECD/DAC	<i>Has its focus on the logical framework, but welcomes innovative methodologies as well</i>
European Commission	<i>The logframe is included in the application procedure for subsidies</i>

## Sources

### Special evaluation unit

- Federale overheidsdienst Buitenlandse zaken, Buitenlandse handel en ontwikkelingssamenwerking (2010). *Koninklijk besluit houdende de oprichting van een dienst Bijzondere Evaluatie van de Internationale Samenwerking. 25 FEBRUARI 2010.* <http://reflex.raadvst-consetat.be/refLex/pdf/Mbbs/2010/03/15/115930.pdf>
- Special Evaluation Unit (2009), The E-valuator, Internal Newsletter no. 4, June, 2009, p. 3.
- DGD (2009). Evaluatie van de kwaliteit van de prestaties van de Belgische Technische Coöperatie (BTC) – 2009
- DGD (2008). Evaluatie van de kwaliteit van de prestaties van de Belgische Technische Coöperatie (BTC) – 2008

### Flanders international cooperation unit (VAIS)

- VAIS (2010). Richtlijnen voor het invullen van het aanvraagformulier oproep OE, <http://ontwikkelingssamenwerking.vlaanderen.be/nlapps/data/docattachments/richtlijnen%20indienen%20projecten%202010.pdf>
- VAIS (2010). Richtlijnen voor het indienen van ontwikkelingseducatieprojecten budget 2010. <http://ontwikkelingssamenwerking.vlaanderen.be/nlapps/data/docattachments/richtlijnen%20aanvraagformulier%202010.pdf>

### Belgian Directorate-General of Development Cooperation (DGD)

- DGD (2010). Reference documents with guidelines for subsidy proposals for NGOs.
- DGD (2010). Internal Report Outcome Mapping Workshop 25 May 2010, Vredeseilanden.

### Policy and Operations Evaluation Department (IOB)

- IOB (2009). *Evaluatiebeleid en richtlijnen voor evaluatie*, <http://www.minbuza.nl/dsresource?objectid=buzabeheer:139652&type=org>

### Netherlands Directorate-General of Development Cooperation (DGIS)

- DGIS (2008). *De Meetlat langs Maatgesneden Monitoring* <http://www.minbuza.nl/dsresource?objectid=buzabeheer:28852&type=org>
- DGIS (2009). *Maatgesneden monitoring, het verhaal achter de cijfers*, <http://ikregeer.nl/document/blg-17205>

### OECD/DAC

- 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](http://www.oecd.org/document/16/0,3343,en_2649_33721_41726352_1_1_1_1,00.html)
- OECD/DAC (1991). *Principles for Evaluation of Development Assistance*, [http://www.oecd.org/document/22/0,2340,en\\_2649\\_34435\\_2086550\\_1\\_1\\_1\\_1,00.html](http://www.oecd.org/document/22/0,2340,en_2649_34435_2086550_1_1_1_1,00.html)

- OECD/DAC (2002). *Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management (2002)*, <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/29/21/2754804.pdf>
- OECD/DAC (2005). *Managing Aid, Practices of DAC member countries, DAC guidelines and reference series*.  
<http://browse.oecdbookshop.org/oecd/pdfs/browseit/4305121E.PDF>
- OECD/DAC (2009). *Managing Aid, Practices of DAC member countries*,  
<http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/58/29/42903202.pdf>
- OECD/DAC (2006). *The Challenge of Capacity Development, Working towards Good Practice*, <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/4/36/36326495.pdf>

### **European Commission**

- 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](http://www.vvsg.be/Internationaal/Noord-Zuid/Wettelijk_kader/Documents/NSA-LA%2020091202%20Guidelines%20for%20grant%20applicants.pdf)
- European Commission (2009). Results Oriented Monitoring (ROM) Handbook.  
[http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/ensuring-quality/rom/documents/rom\\_handbook2009\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/ensuring-quality/rom/documents/rom_handbook2009_en.pdf)

### **United Kingdom**

- *IACD (2009)*, The quality of dfid's evaluation reports and assurance systems, by Burt Perrin and Richard Manning. <http://iacdi.independent.gov.uk/2009/12/evaluation-quality-review-synthesis/>