ASSIGNMENT ONE

NAME: FREDRICK M. MATE

1. Giving examples differentiate between monitoring and evaluation

There is a clear difference between monitoring and evaluation.

a) Definition

According to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) definition, monitoring is a continuous function that applies systematic data collection on specified indicators to provide managers and the key stakeholders of a continuing project with indications of the degree of progress and performance of objectives and progress in the use of allocated resources (OECD, 2010). On the other hand, evaluation is the appraisal in a systematic and objective assessment of a continuing or completed programme or project, on its design, fulfillment and final outcome results with the purpose of finding out the relevance and implementation of the goals, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and viability (OECD, 2010).

b) Main Actions

Monitoring keeps progress, control, analyses and documents tracks while evaluation assesses and comparatively examines of the project or programme (Julia H, Affette & McCaw-Binns, 2012). For example, a report by Foreign and Agricultural Office (FAO) on the Project "Trans boundary Agro-Ecosystem Management Programme for the Kagera River Basin (shared by Tanzania, Uganda, Rwanda and Burundi) which was executed by the Division of Environment, Vice Presidents' Office in Tanzania; Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock in Burundi; Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries in Uganda; Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources in Rwanda; the project had shown how monitoring had marinating the project progress with key activities documented and followed up and at the mid-term and final review the expected outcomes were compared and analysed to find out the relevance, effectiveness, and impact of the project (FAO, 2017a).

c) Scope

Monitoring concentrates on inputs, tasks, yields, implementation process while evaluation concentrates in relation to inputs, results in relation to cost, processes used to achieve results, overall effectiveness and relevance, impact and sustainability (Julia, Affette & McCaw-Binns, 2012). International Platform on Sport and Development, (2019) explains that monitoring should assist to learn from practices, to enhance practices and tasks in the future, to have resource accountability both internally and externally, and the outputs acquired, to take sound judgments on the future of the initiative and to push for empowerment of recipients of the initiative. On the other hand evaluations should help to make decisions about the following key aspects of the intervention: effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, impact and sustainability (International Platform on Sport and Development, 2019).

For example, a final evaluation report by FAO on the Project "Trans boundary Agro-Ecosystem Management Programme for the Kagera River Basin the project had clear monitoring systems with implementation process including the activities and outputs capturing the project management, management of financial resources and the outcomes on performance indicators. The final evaluation further examines the relevance of the project (towards country objectives and communities, farmers and agricultural technologist, land degradation focal area strategy), the efficiency (on finances and time) the effectiveness (on meeting policy goals, targets, reduction of land degradation, improving agricultural productivity etc.), sustainability (institutional, environmental, financial) and, the project impact (FAO, 2017a).

d) Timing and frequency

The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) reports that monitoring continues throughout the programme/project implementation whereas evaluation assess the complete cycle of the programme/project (UNODC, 2019a). The frequency of monitoring is periodic and regular while that of evaluation is episodic. For example a World Health Organization (WHO) Regional Office for the Western Pacific programme on monitoring and evaluation of the 100% condom use programme in entertainment establishments indicated that the monitoring condom data was to be collected more regularly at either monthly, quarterly or half yearly intervals (WHO, 2002). In a separate example, an evaluation by The United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) Evaluation office published in 2019 sought to find out how well UNICEF respond to the short to medium-term threats to children's well-being and development in South Sudan between January 2016 and May 2018 (James, Hisham. & Volker, 2019) This evaluation was conducted after the 28 months' period of the programme.

e) Depth and purpose

Monitoring focuses on the project implementation, with comparison between what is delivered and what was planned while evaluation reviews the achievements of the project/ programme and considers whether the plan was the best one to achieve the outcomes (UNODC, 2019a). The purpose of monitoring is to modify project plans. Evaluation on the other hand measures accomplishments, including positive or negative and planned or unplanned effects. Evaluation find out the lessons to be learned from both achievements and lack of it, and also finds out for best practices that can be used elsewhere (UNODC, 2019a). The purpose of evaluation is to check on the project/programme impact and to inform future programmes. For example, a report on United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), evaluation of humanitarian assistance in Yemen indicated that the UNICEF Yemen operations attained a high level of conformity with the appropriate Core Commitments for Children (CCCs) standard. However, this evaluation did not find enough evidence to resolve that the relevance of the CCCs and likewise, the level of compliance with making help more suitable (Haider, 2016). The report further indicates that UNICEF country offices could enhance preparedness-level conformity, which consequently would have positive impact on response compliance.

f) Sources of Data

The source of monitoring information and data is from activities and output tracking mechanisms like collection of data, matrices and forms, personnel records, annual task plans, observations in the field, reports on progress, rapid reviews while evaluation gets its data from what was collected in monitoring and, additional questionnaire surveys for baseline, focused group discussions, interviews from main informant, case studies etc. (Julia, Affette & McCaw-Binns, 2012). Data gathered and observations made in the process of monitoring is then fed into and used by the evaluation process (UNODC, 2019a). This forms the relationship between monitoring and evaluation. During an evaluation, data from earlier monitoring processes is used to comprehend the approach in which the programme or project advanced and accelerated change (International Platform on Sport and Development, 2019). Further the International Platform on Sport and Development, (2019) reports that the evaluation process is a scrutiny or understanding of the data that is collected which burrows deeper into the connections between the outcome of the project or programme, the effects caused by the project or programme and the general impact of the project or program. In the example above on Trans boundary Agro-Ecosystem Management Programme for the Kagera River Basin, the monitoring data was collected using template forms and this was later reviewed these documents for evaluation and

additional used various evaluation tools and resources including participatory observations, focused group interviews, individual interviews and an evaluation matrix (FAO, 2017a).

g) Responsibility

Monitoring is performed internally by way of self-assessment by project and programme managers, the administrators and community stakeholders (Julia H, Affette & McCaw-Binns, 2012). According to World Health Organization (WHO), monitoring is routinely performed by project personnel, project partners and peer instructors as they keep progress of their tasks (WHO, 2019). As explained by Council for International Development (CID), evaluation is led by external and independent parties and not assisted by the group that is fulfilling the project i.e. the project personnel, their managers or their administrators (CID, 2014). The WHO (2019) further explains that evaluations can be carried out by external agencies or by project personnel, peer workers and collaborators, or by a combining project personnel, peer workers, collaborators and external agencies. The inclusion of external agencies leads to technical skills and objectivity during evaluations.

Case in example, in the Project "Trans boundary Agro-Ecosystem Management Programme for the Kagera River Basin the project proposal had indicated that the progress and performance of the project monitoring and reports was the responsibility of the regional project coordinator, national project managers and the regional geographic information system remote center. However, mid-term and final evaluation of this project was to be done independently organized by FAO and incorporating the beneficiary countries. The mid-term review was later carried out by independent consultants Dr. Ingrid Hartmann from Germany, Mr. Jean-Joseph Bellamy (independent reviewer) from Canada, Prof. Bancy Mati from Kenya and Mr. Omar Awabdeh from FAO evaluation office (FAO, 2017a).

2. Why is baseline survey an important part in project management?

International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) reports that a baseline survey alludes to measurements of important indicators before a project starts, from which evaluation of change and its progress can be conducted (IFRC, 2013). The importance of baseline surveys in project management include the following:

a) Setting targets

According to IFRC (2013), baseline data assists to set indicator targets that are achievable and realistic for each point of result in a design of a project, for example logframe, and after that determine and modify progress against these targets and their corresponding results.

b) Inform decision making in project management

A baseline survey gives a reference point to decide progress and vary the implementation of the project to suit the needs of the people (IFRC, 2013). For example, the World Food Program (WFP) developed a baseline study whose one objective was to act as beginning point in which WFP was to assess the impact of food for work asset creation activities on food security and livelihoods in target areas in Lao PDR (World Food Program, 2008).

c) Promote participation of stakeholders

The process of conducting a baseline survey provides an impetus for conversation and motivation among members of the community members and project partners on the best pertinent means of action (IFRC, 2013). For example, in a study conducted in Eastern Uganda

it was found out that the problems relating to maternal and newborn were well understood by involving the stakeholders therefore guiding selection of the interventions implemented in the project and subsequently it was possible to engage them during the implementation stages (Kananura et al., 2017).

d) Assess the selected indicator measurability

According to IFRC (2013) the baseline survey data is used to assess how measurable are the selected indicators and adjust the system for measurement sin the future. Case in example, a baseline survey for project output and livelihoods support assessment by DanChurchAid in Uganda analysed data collected in the project to provide measurable benchmark information for the host communities and the refugees (DanChurchAid, 2017). With the information collected the survey recommended on the appropriate indicators that should be used in the project implementation.

e) Promote accountability

The baseline survey promotes accountability and informs impact assessment to correlate and measure the differences that the project makes (IFRC, 2013). An Oxfam America baseline report in Ghana objective aimed at analyzing and documenting the position around accountability, governance and transparency of the oil and gas earnings in the country at the initial phases of the Oxfam project (Katinka, 2017).

3. Distinguish between summative and formative evaluation methods with examples.

Formative evaluation is used to assess the impact of the project while it is continuing and allows for additional improvements to take place in the right time. This means assessing the value of the inputs (parts and the complete system) before assessing the outputs (the impact of the complete system) with the logic being that valuable inputs will lead to valuable outputs (Chow & Bucknall, 2012). Chow and Bucknall (2012) further reports that summative evaluation concentrates on the yields and short-term and long-term impact or results. The concentration is on the final outputs whether they been achieved, or whether they are being measured or if they have not been achieved what are the explanations.

According to the World Health Organization (WHO), differentiates these two major types of evaluation based on their main objectives, that is objectives for formative evaluation based on needs assessment, process evaluation and implementation evaluation while objectives for summative evaluation are based on performance evaluation, impact evaluation and economic evaluation (WHO, 2016). These are illustrated below.

Formative Evaluation:

a) The WHO (2016) explains that needs assessment helps decide who requires the intervention, how important their need is, and what activities will best take care of those needs. This seeks to answer questions like what are the stakeholders needs and what intervention tasks will best take care of these needs. Case in example is the Kagera River Basin project carried out by FAO in Tanzania, Uganda, Rwanda and Burundi that shows an example of needs assessment prior to carrying out a project. Before the commencement of the project field assessment were carried out where the identification of key components of the full project was influenced by a mixture of available studies and documentation augmented by local and expert awareness of the farming status, agro-ecosystem and

ecosystem services within the regions where strategic project interventions were situated (Bunning, Burgess & Woodfine, 2005). The mid-term evaluation of Kagera Basin Project also found out that the project document showed that a reliable contextual scrutiny of the project inclusive of the review of the baseline and the lessons learned from other important initiatives in the area was carried out (FAO, 2017b). The final evaluation report considered the project ***relevance*** to the countries and communities involved, the farmers and agricultural technologist, to the Kagera basin ecology, and to the land degradation key areas (FAO, 2017a).

b) Process evaluation assesses outputs associated to intervention activities and inputs where it can be carried out continuously or measured once (WHO, 2016). This is illustrated with questions on whether the intervention was carried out as it was intended. For example, the monitoring and evaluation plan for Transboundary Agro-Ecosystem Management Project in the Kagera Basin the project performance was to be evaluated by assessing the project's ***efficiency*** in attaining the outputs with the inputs specified and activities carried out (Rioux, 2011). The Kagera Basin final evaluation report had assessed the project financial efficiency and found out that the cost efficiency in setting up a transboundary structure was rather low and in time efficiency there were many delays in project execution (FAO, 2017a).

c) Implementation evaluation monitors the conformity of the intervention to the set standards (WHO, 2016). This intends to find out whether the implementation is occurring in agreement with original project protocols. as an example, the Kagera Basin Project monitoring and evaluation plan had considered monthly, quarterly and semiannual progress report that had to give an explanation of exact implementation of project tasks compared to those expected in the annual work plan, and the attainment of outputs and progress towards accomplishing the outcomes for the project (Rioux, 2011).

Summative Evaluation:

a) Performance or outcome evaluation assesses the ***effectiveness*** of intervention tasks on immediate and intermediate adjustments in main outcomes, along with knowledge, provision of services, usage and coverage (WHO, 2016). This seeks to answer questions like in terms of provision whether the services available or what is the effect of the intervention on adjustments delivery of service. In terms of utilization it raises questions on whether the services are being used and on coverage it seeks to find out whether the population targeted was reached. For example, the Kagera Basin Project final evaluation report evaluated the effectiveness of the project in meeting the following; project goals, targets for reducing land degradation, improving agricultural productivity among others and in conclusion it reported that the project implementation effectiveness at the technical level was best, however, at the institutional and political levels it was less effective, particularly with concern to transboundary matters (FAO, 2017a).

b) According to WHO (2016), the impact evaluation assesses the long-term overall effects or ***impact*** of the intervention on main outcomes. It seeks to ask questions on whether the improvements in outcomes were related to the intervention. For example, in the Kagera basin project the final evaluation found out that the project enhanced a vibrant transfer of knowledge among farmers, which enabled possible progress to higher levels of protection of land and agricultural production by stimulating innovation through exchange of knowledge among farmers (FAO, 2017a). the report also concludes that the project impact included creation of overwhelming vibrant economies in some areas; particularly where

farmers could convert from extensive to sustainable forms of land management, and in the process improved livelihood which enabled many of them to build new houses and take their children to school (FAO, 2017a).

c) Financial evaluation intends to decide whether there was a probable value for money from a project (WHO, 2016). For example, the Kagera Basin project financial ***sustainability*** evaluation found that the project was improving in financial sustainability compared to the midterm review where governmental support and investment and saving capacities of communities was growing as well as improved savings in the communities like in Uganda that formed a community District Bank (FAO, 2017a).

4. Monitoring and evaluation uses both qualitative and quantitative methods to measure the success and impact of the projects. However, economists and stasticians adapt a one sided method (quantitative) to analyze the results.

a) Identify the potential dangers of a one sided monitoring system.

There are a number of threats on using only quantitative methods to analyze monitoring and evaluation results.

i. Nearly all quantitative evaluation plans adopt a pre and post test comparison plan and therefore, information is usually not gathered on the process of implementation of the project which is key for effective monitoring to achieve effective evaluation. (Bamberger et al., 2009). For example, if the interpretation of results does not identify any statistically significant variances between the project and comparison groups, it is impossible to decide whether this is as result of failure in project design or as a result of failure in project implementation. A mixed methods approach could include process analysis by using qualitative methods like participant observation, interviews from key informants and focused group interviews to measure the process of implementation of the project implementation and how this affected program outcomes and impacts (Bamberger et al., 2009).

ii. Traditional evaluation plans depend on an inadequate number of uni-dimensional quantitative indicators to assess impacts and outcomes of the project. Nevertheless, many constructs (for example leadership, empowerment, poverty, and community organization) are intricate and multidimensional, making quantitative indicators susceptible to issues with construct validity issues (Bamberger et al., 2009). Including qualitative indicators may be useful to help understand the meaning of the qualitative indicators.

iii. According to Bamberger et al., (2009) most quantitative methods are not suitable for gathering sensitive data (such as domestic violence, operation of community and other kinds of organizations, social and cultural factors limiting access to services), or for finding and interviewing inaccessible groups (e.g. criminal gang, commercial sex workers, marginalized groups).

iv. Most quantitative designs are not able to include the range of the local contexts in which each project is implemented, which in the process can lead to significant

variances in the project outcomes in different regions issues (Bamberger et al., 2009). Mixed methods approach can assist to give comprehensive contextual analysis.

v. Bamberger, Rao and Woolcock (2009) report that quantitative designs are usually not flexible in that the same tool for collecting data, assessing the same indicators must be used to the same or a similar sample prior and after the project has been executed. This causes them to be plenty less effective for real-time learning by doing, and for monitoring. Mixed methods can add a number of quick feedback methods to contribute to this flexibility to adjust to changing circumstances.

b) Critically analyze the quantitative method often employed by economists and stasticians in monitoring and evaluating development projects

There are two types of quantitative evaluations applied by economists, that is, ex post and ex ante (Shahidur et al., 2010). Shahidur et al., (2010) explains that an ex ante evaluation tries to assess the intended effects of future programs and policies, given the prevailing situation of a targeted area and may use simulations based on assumptions about how the economy works. However, in contrast an ex post evaluation assesses actual effects experienced by the beneficiaries that are traceable to intervention of the program. Ex ante evaluations use structural models based on the economic environment that is affecting the potential participants. These models are used to predict the effects or impacts of the project. On the contrary, ex post evaluations show the immediate benefits and are a reflection of the reality on the participants (Shahidur et al., 2010).

As explained by Shahidur et. al., (2010) the ex ante structural models target to capture the mechanisms under which the program impacts on the participants, however, the ex post evaluation tends to miss on this mechanism. In comparison to the ex ante evaluation, the ex post evaluations may be much more expensive reason being they require data collection data on exact outcomes for the groups participating and those not, including on other coexisting economic and social factors that may have influenced the intervention course. These extra expenses in ex post evaluations are the intervention failure that may have been predicted using the models in ex ante quantitative evaluations.

5. Logical Framework

a) Define Logical Framework

A logical framework (or logframe) is a tool for project design, monitoring and evaluation that basically encompasses planning that is oriented towards goal and objective for implementation of the project (Myrick, 2013). The log frame is a way of organizing the main components in a project and focusing the logical connections between them (UNODC, 2019b).

b) Define and Explain key components of Logical framework

The Humanitarian Leadership Academy (HLA) reports that logframe is one of the logic models used in project management, including the theory of change and results framework. However, the logframe gives a degree of detail that is not included in the theory of change and the results framework (HLA, 2019). The HLA (2019) clarifies that the logic models are recommended to be designed in the following order; first theory of change then results framework and lastly logframe. This is because the components from each model is used to build onto the subsequent model as explained below.

The Theory of Change

The components of theory of change includes the following;

a) **The Goal:** This describes the broad strategic intervention areas of the project.
b) **Domains of change:** These are the broad strategic intervention areas that are directly responsible for attaining the long-term goal of the project.
c) **Preconditions:** This designs the pathways of change or structures that are required for the long-term change to happen.
d) **Assumptions:** This identifies the assumptions which are beyond the project management control that are required for the project success.

For example, concerning the Dadaab Refugee camp in Kenya the project to uplift the lives of refugees may have the following:

i. Long-term Goal
   - Better livelihood for the refugees in Dadaab Refugee Camp

ii. Domain of change
   - Reduced incidence of waterborne diseases among the refugees

iii. Preconditions
   - Refugees have accessible and safe water supply; establishment of watering points, treatment of water
   - Improved hygiene practices; trained water sanitation and hygiene (WASH) volunteers, campaigns on hand washing and waste management

iv. Assumptions
   - The security situation does not get worse
   - The National government of Kenya will not repatriate refugees in the near future
   - The National government will sink more boreholes as planned
   - The County government of Garissa will initiate waste collection from the camp

Results Framework

The results framework only incorporates interventions that are under the direct responsibility of the project management and builds from the theory of change as listed below;

a) **Goal:** corresponds with the long-term goal in the theory of change
b) **Strategic objectives**: corresponds with the domains of change in the theory of change
c) **Intermediate results:** This corresponds with the preconditions or pathways of change in the theory of change.
d) **Outputs**: This also corresponds to the preconditions in the theory of change that are required to be met to achieve the major preconditions that form intermediate results. They are also referred to as project deliverables

In the above example on refugee project in Dadaab Refugee camp the following may be given as follows;

i. Goal
   - Refugees in Dadaab Refugee camp have better livelihood

ii. Strategic objective
   - The incidence of waterborne disease reduces among the refugees

iii. Intermediate results
   - Improvement in supply of adequate and safe water to refugees

- Refugees have improvement in their hygiene practices

iv. Outcomes
- Establishment of water points in all parts of the camp
- Chlorine for treatment of water is provided at household level
- Volunteers improve knowledge on WASH
- Refugees knowledge on hand washing and waste management is improved

Logical Framework (Logframe)

The logframe build from the components of the theory of change and results framework with additional components, that is, the indicators, means of verification and the activities (HLA, 2019). Activities comprise the work to be done for the outputs of the project. The key components of the logframe include the objective statements/project description, indicators, and means of verification/measurement methods and assumptions, and the logical linkages between them (HLA, 2019). The HLA (2019) further reports that the logframe commonly uses five level matrix, however, there are many separate ways to organize it, depending on the institution or financier. The Table 1 below shows a sample five level matrix logframe.

Table 1. The Logframe

Objective Statements/Project Description	**Indicators**	**Means of Verification/Measurement Methods**	**Assumptions**
Goal			
Strategic Objectives/Purpose			
Intermediate Results/Component Objectives			
Outputs			
Activities			

a) Objective Statements or Project Description

The objectives are statements that describe the project at each level of the goal, strategic objectives, intermediate results and outputs that are created during the results framework (HLA, 2019). They form the vertical logic of the project (HLA, 2019). According to the HLA (2019) the objective statements at the higher level of the matrix tend to be strategic in nature (the goal and strategic objectives) while those in the lower levels tend to be more operational (the outputs and activities). They provide the information indicating the following;

i. **Those who change** (individuals, institutions, communities, governments, populations etc.)
ii. **That which changes** (behavior, technologies, knowledge, coverage models, policies, systems, data etc.)
iii. **The description of the change** (decrease, increase, reduce, improve, integrate, adopt, establish, or use etc.)

In the Dadaab Refugee camp project example given these will follow the goal, strategic objectives, intermediate results and outcomes as designed in the results framework. In addition, the activities which are the project deliverables may be designed as follows;

i. Community water management to connect water to different parts of the camp
ii. Volunteers to distribute chlorine tablets to all households in the camp
iii. Volunteers trained on WASH
iv. Campaigns held across the camp on hand washing and waste management

b) Assumptions

Assumptions are the resources or circumstances that are not under the direct control of project managers, even though they still must be complied with for progress to be made in the direction of attaining the project long-term goal (HLA, 2019). They form the horizontal logic of the project which means at each level (goal, strategic objectives, intermediate results, outputs and activities) of the logical framework the assumption at that level should hold true so that it achieves the objective statement at the subsequent level (HLA, 2019). The assumptions are selected from the theory of change.

In the example of Dadaab refugee camp project the following assumptions may apply at different levels of the vertical logic;

i. Goal
   - The security situation does not get worse
   - The National government of Kenya will not repatriate refugees in the near future
ii. Outcomes
   - The National government will sink more boreholes as planned
   - The County government of Garissa will initiate waste collection from the camp

c) Indicators

Indicators are methods used to record progress, show change, or measure the performance of the project (HLA, 2019). They provide valuable information to assist managers to decide on whether or not any there is need for changes in project interventions. The HLA (2019) further explains that indicators should be specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time bound (SMART). Ideally, indicators are not set for the goal and activities unless if it is a requirement by the donor or for other purposes.

The indicators can be direct or indirect (proxy). Direct indicators follow up on change by directly looking at what the evaluators are trying to measure (HLA, 2019). For example, in the Dadaab Refugee camp project the project team may want to set the indicators for the campaigns held across the camp on hand washing. The direct indicator may be set the indicator as *"by the end of the first year of the project 70% of refugees increase their hand washing at important times."* This indicator would be assessed by directly observing the number of refugees that wash their hands for example after visiting the pit latrines. This would require time and higher budgets to measure, however, it would show the level of consistency in the handwashing among the refugees. Indirect indicators follow up on change by evaluating markers that are generally allowed as being proxies for outcomes the project team is measuring (HLA, 2019). In the above example, the proxy indicator may be set as *"By the end of the first year of the project 70% of pit latrines have both soap and hand washing water present at all times."* This indicator will indirectly link the presence of soap and hand washing water in the pit latrines to

hand washing practices. It would require less time and budget to measure, however, it would not show the frequency or consistency of handwashing among the refugees.

d) Means of Verification

These are the methods of measurement that can exist or can be provided to assist in measurement of the achievement of goal and strategic objectives and to verify the attainment of the outputs and activities (UNODC, 2019b). The methods of measurement determine how the project will collect the data to follow up on the indicators (HLA, 2019). The HLA (2019) further explains that while selecting means of verification, it is considered whether to use primary or secondary data sources and whether to use qualitative or quantitative methods.

The HLA (2019) states that primary data are gathered directly by the project personnel/stakeholders and give the most reliable and suitable data for assessing project progress. On the other hand, secondary data include existing reports, records and statistics and is available from published or unpublished sources.

Quantitative methods assess amounts, whether in exact numbers, percentages or ratios and are extensively applied in development projects reason being they provide a very clear measurement and are easy to compare between projects over time (HLA, 2019). However, qualitative methods gather the experiences of participants using pictures, words, and stories. This is analyzed through thematic analysis, identification of topics and keywords. In some instances, both quantitative and qualitative methods (mixed method approach) can be employed.

The indicators for these activities would then be;

i. By the first 6 months of the project additional 100 water points have been introduced
ii. By the 3rd month of the project 100 percent of households are supplied with chlorine tablets
iii. By the first year of the project 200 volunteers are trained on WASH
iv. Every 3 months from the start of the project 10 campaigns are held across the camp on hand hygiene and waste management

The examples of means of verification would be;

i. The number of watering points introduced in the first 6 months of the project
ii. The percentage of household provided with chlorine tablets by the 3rd month of the project
iii. The number of volunteers trained on WASH by the first year of the project
iv. The number of campaigns on hand hygiene and waste management held every 3 months from the start of the project

REFERENCES

Bamberger M., Rao V. & Woolcock M. (2009). *Using Mixed Methods in Monitoring and Evaluation: Experiences from International Development*.

Bunning S., Burgess J. and Woodfine A. (2005). Development of Field Assessment Methods Using Transects And Other PRA Techniques for Sample Sites Across the River Basin. Retrieved from http://www.fao.org/tempref/agl/agll/kageradocs/04milestones_events/diagnostic_workshop_report_back.doc

Chow, A. S., & Bucknall, T. (2012). 5 - Evaluation: is technology meeting the needs of the organization's users? In A. S. Chow & T. B. T.-L. T. and U. S. Bucknall (Eds.), *Chandos Information Professional Series* (pp. 95–103). https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-1-84334-638-8.50005-9

Council for International Development. (2014). Monitoring Versus Evaluation. Retrieved July 25, 2019, from https://www.cid.org.nz/assets/Key-issues/Good-Development-Practice/Factsheet-17-Monitoring-versus-evaluation.pdf

DanChurchAid. (2017). *Baseline Survey for Project Output and Livelihoods Support Assessment*.

Food and Agriculture Organization. (2017a). Final Evaluation of "Transboundary Agro-Ecosystem Management Programme for the Kagera River Basin (Kagera TAMP)" GCP /RAF/424/GFF GEF ID 2139. Retrieved July 26, 2019, from https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/project_documents/GEFID2139_2017_TER_FAO_Regional%2520Africa_Kagera.pdf

Food and Agriculture Organization. (2017b). Mid-Term Evaluation of the FAO-GEF Project: "Transboundary Agro-Ecosystem Management Programme for the Kagera River Basin (Kagera TAMP)" (GCP /RAF/424/GFF). Retrieved July 26, 2019, from http://www.ipcinfo.org/fileadmin/user_upload/oed/docs/GCPRAF424GFF_2013_ER.pdf

Haider, N. (2016). Evaluation report 2016 Yemen: Evaluation of Humanitarian Assistance (EHA). Retrieved July 25, 2019, from UNICEF website: https://www.unicef.org/evaldatabase/index_95500.html

Humanitarian Leadership Academy. (2019). MEAL DPro: Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning. Retrieved July 28, 2019, from https://kayaconnect.org/pluginfile.php/120256/mod_scorm/content/1/scormdriver/indexAPI.html

International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. (2013). *Baseline Basics*.

International Platform on Sport & Development. (2019). What is monitoring and evaluation (M&E)? Retrieved July 25, 2019, from https://www.sportanddev.org/en/toolkit/monitoring-and-evaluation/what-monitoring-and-evaluation-me

James D., Hisham K., Volker H., Ramlat. M. and Awuda A. (2019). Evaluation report 2019 Evaluation Office: UNICEF Response to the South Sudan Humanitarian Situation. Retrieved July 25, 2019, from UNICEF website: https://www.unicef.org/evaldatabase/index_103550.html

Julia H., McCaw-Binns A., Rodger. W. (2012). *Maternal and Perinatal Health in Developing Countries*. CAB International.

Kananura R.M., Ekirapa-Kiracho E., Paina L., Bumba A., Mulekwa G., Nakiganda-Busiku D., Htet Nay Lin Oo, Kiwanuka S.N., Asha G., and David P. (2017). Participatory monitoring and evaluation approaches that influence decision-making: lessons from a maternal and newborn study in Eastern Uganda. *Health Research and Policy Systems, 15*(2), 107. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12961-017-0274-9

Katinka C. van Cranenburgh. (2017). *Accountability through Active Citizenship: Improving Petroleum Governance in Ghana, Mozambique and Tanzania, End of Project evaluation-Ghana*.

Myrick, D. (2013). A Logical Framework for Monitoring and Evaluation: A Pragmatic Approach to M&E. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, 4*(14). https://doi.org/Doi:10.5901/mjss.2013.v4n14p423

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2010). Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management. Retrieved from http://www.oecd.org/development/peer-reviews/2754804.pdf

Rioux, J. (2011). Monitoring & Evaluation Plan Transboundary Agro-Ecosystem Management Project in the Kagera Basin : Rwanda, Burundi, Uganda and Tanzania. Retrieved from http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/nr/kagera/Documents/MnE_Plan_Kagera_FINAL_annexes.pdf

Shahidur R. Khandker, G. B. K. and H. A. S. (2010). *Handbook on Impact Evaluation Quantitative Methods and Practices*. Offi ce of the Publisher, The World Bank.

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. (2019a). Tool 10.1 Overview of monitoring and evaluation. Retrieved July 25, 2019, from https://www.unodc.org/documents/human-trafficking/Toolkit-files/08-58296_tool_10-1.pdf

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. (2019b). Tool 10.3 Logical framework. Retrieved July 28, 2019, from https://www.unodc.org/documents/human-trafficking/Toolkit-files/08-58296_tool_10-3.pdf

World Health Organization. (2002). *Monitoring and Evaluation of the 100% Condome Use Programme in Entertainment Establishments 2002*.

World Health Organization. (2016). *Monitoring and Evaluating Digital Health Interventions A practical guide to conducting research and assessment*. World Health Organization.

World Health Organization. (2019). HIV/AIDS Category 6: Monitoring and evaluation. Retrieved July 26, 2019, from https://www.who.int/hiv/topics/vct/sw_toolkit/monitoring_and_evaluation/en/

World Food Program. (2008). *Asset Creation Impact Assessment Baseline Study Report*.