




cutting through complexity

Monitoring and Evaluation in the Development Sector

A KPMG International Development Assistance Services (IDAS) practice survey

KPMG INTERNATIONAL



Contents

Foreword – Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) Survey	5
--	----------

Survey highlights	6
--------------------------	----------

Monitoring	8
-------------------	----------

Purpose of monitoring	9
Monitoring system effectiveness	9

Evaluation purpose	10
---------------------------	-----------

Evaluation priorities	10
Decision rules	11
Tracking outputs and outcomes	11

Evaluation management and approaches	12
---	-----------

Institutional arrangements	13
Change in M&E approaches	14
Evaluation methodologies	15
Evaluation techniques	16
Strengths and weaknesses of evaluation	17





Use of new technology 18

Roadblocks to using technology 19

Evaluation feedback loops 20

Timeliness of evaluations 20

Resources for monitoring and evaluation 22

Availability of M&E resources 22

Role models in M&E 23

Methodology Case Study: Outcome mapping 24

Survey methodology 27

Glossary 28

Bookshelf 30



Foreword

Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) Survey

We are pleased to present findings from KPMG's Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Survey, which polled more than 35 respondents from organizations responsible for over US\$100 billion of global development expenditure. The survey reflects perspectives from M&E leaders on the current state, including approaches, resources, use of technology and major challenges facing a variety of funders and implementers.

At a time of increasing public scrutiny of development impacts, there is increased focus in many development agencies on M&E tools and techniques. The objective of KPMG's M&E Survey was to understand current approaches to M&E and their impact on project funding, design, and learning. More effective M&E is necessary to help government officials, development managers, civil society organizations and funding entities to better plan their projects, improve progress, increase impact, and enhance learning. With an estimated global spend of over US\$350 billion per annum on development programs by bilateral, multilateral, and not-for-profit organizations, improvements in M&E have the potential to deliver benefits worth many millions of dollars annually.

Our survey reveals a range of interesting findings, reflecting the diversity of institutions consulted. Common themes include:

- A growing demand to measure results and impact
- Dissatisfaction with use of findings to improve the delivery of new programs
- Resourcing as an important constraint for many respondents
- New technology is still in its infancy in application

On behalf of KPMG, we would like to thank those who participated in this survey. We hope the findings are useful to you in addressing the challenges in designing and implementing development projects and also to build on the lessons learned. By enhancing the impact and delivery of development projects, we can all help to address more effectively the challenges facing developing countries.



Timothy A. A. Stiles
Global Chair, IDAS



Trevor Davies
Global Head, IDAS Center of Excellence

Survey


highlights

No clear consensus on terminology or approach



Survey respondents used divergent organizational definitions of various M&E terms. This is potentially problematic for both donors and implementers for a variety of reasons, including lack of clarity on monitoring approaches and evaluation techniques. (See Glossary for terminology used in this report).

Availability of more sophisticated evaluation models and techniques doesn't guarantee their use



Although there are a wide range of evaluation techniques available, ranging from the highly technical (such as counterfactual studies) to the innovative, (such as Social Return on Investment (SROI)), our survey indicates that the most widely used techniques are in fact quite basic. The top three techniques used are:

1. "Logical frameworks"
2. "Performance indicators" and
3. "Focus groups"

Need for stronger and more timely feedback loops to synthesize and act on lessons learned




Project improvement and accountability to funders drives the motivation for monitoring projects. The vast majority of respondents said they monitor projects for project improvement, and also said that they carry out evaluations to ensure that lessons are learned and to improve the development impact of their projects.

However, over half of respondents identified "Changes in policy and practice from evaluation" as "poor" or "variable" and nearly half of all respondents identified as a weakness or major weakness the ability of their "Feedback mechanisms to translate into changes."

This presumably means that reports are produced but they are not acted upon often enough or in a timely fashion, representing a missed opportunity.

Adoption of new technologies is lagging



The use of innovative technologies, such as mobile applications, to address international development challenges has gained recent attention. When asked about use of technology to collect, manage and analyze data, the vast majority of respondents said that "Information and Communication Technology enabled visualizations" were "never" or "rarely" used; and almost as many respondents indicated that "GPS data," a relatively accessible technology, was never or rarely used.

This means that M&E is still a labor-intensive undertaking.

Lack of access to quality data and financial restrictions are the key impediments to improving M&E systems



Over half of respondents identified a lack of financial resources as a major challenge to improving the organization's evaluation system.

A similar majority of respondents estimated levels of resourcing for evaluation at 2 percent or less of the program budget, which many survey respondents indicated to be inadequate.

Policy implications and recommendations

01

Development organizations should expand their use of innovative approaches to M&E, using information and communication technology enabled tools to harness the power of technology to reduce the costs of gathering real-time data.

02

Development organizations need to strengthen feedback from evaluation into practice through rapid action plans, with systematic tracking, and more effective and adequately resourced project and program monitoring practices and systems.

03

It is a false economy to underinvest in M&E as the savings in M&E costs are likely to be lost through reduced aid and development effectiveness. Organizations should monitor the M&E expenditure as a share of program, and move towards industry benchmarks where spending is low.

04

Standardized terminology and approaches, such as that provided by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee, should be applied within nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and philanthropic organizations, in order to standardize and professionalize approaches to M&E.

05

Evaluation approaches in NGOs are driven by donors without adequate harmonization of approaches and joint working. Donors should apply the principles of harmonization not just to developing countries, but also to NGO intermediaries, both to reduce the administrative burden and to allow a more strategic and effective approach.

06

Evaluation systems should include opportunities for feedback from primary beneficiaries.

07

Project evaluations should be synthesized appropriately through adequate investment in sector and thematic reviews and evaluations.

08

Fully independent evaluation organizations or institutions provide an effective model to professionalize and scale up evaluation work, with appropriate support from independent experts.

Monitoring

Achieving maximum development impact is high among the priorities for monitoring, but challenges remain in using information to improve program delivery. Less than half the respondents stated that organizations always or very frequently update targets and strategies, and in less than 40 percent of cases do organizations always or very frequently produce clear action plans with follow-up.




Purpose of monitoring

Question: What is the key focus of the organization in project monitoring?

The most important purposes of monitoring are for project improvement (91 percent of respondents) and accountability to funders (87 percent). Organizations are more aware of monitoring accountability to funders than to their own internal boards. It is also striking, in the current climate, that value for money is accorded a relatively lower priority for monitoring information than most other motivations.

“Monitoring data is seen as a very important input to evaluation, but since the data are not often there, its use is limited.”

Figure 1: “Most important” or “Very important” monitoring objectives
(multiple responses allowed)




Source: *Monitoring and Evaluation in the Development Sector*, KPMG International, 2014.

Monitoring system effectiveness

Question: How would you assess the monitoring system of your organization?

The basics of the monitoring system are functional in most of the organizations covered. The strengths of monitoring systems include monitoring in line with project plans at inception and aggregation of monitoring results. Relative challenges include lack of sufficient staffing and resources, and the failure to produce clear action plans with appropriate follow-up to ensure that issues identified during monitoring are effectively actioned.

Figure 2: “Always” or “Very frequently” used monitoring attributes
(multiple responses allowed)



Source: *Monitoring and Evaluation in the Development Sector*, KPMG International, 2014.

Evaluation

purpose

“Learning is the most important objective. However, the Directorate would say that showing politicians we are effective to secure future funding is paramount.”


There are many factors which influence why organizations undertake evaluations of their activities, and these are not mutually exclusive. Broadly speaking these are focused around operational effectiveness, and external accountability to different constituencies.

Evaluation priorities

Question: What are the main reasons why your organization conducts formal evaluations?

Eighty-five percent of respondents indicated that learning lessons was a key motivation for evaluation, followed closely by 82 percent that identified development impact. Relatively less emphasis is given to accountability to taxpayers and trustees, and attracting additional funding. Operational effectiveness is the more dominant reason why organizations undertake evaluation. In terms of accountability, improving transparency and accountability dominate; however, some organizations struggled to rank effectiveness above accountability.

Figure 3: “Most important” or “Very important” evaluation objectives
(multiple responses allowed)



Source: *Monitoring and Evaluation in the Development Sector*, KPMG International, 2014.

Decision rules

Question: Are there decision rules which you follow when deciding when/how to invest in evaluation? If yes, what are they?

Respondents indicated a variety of reasons for how their organizations approach the question of when and whether evaluations are undertaken, reflecting the diverse nature of institutions and contexts.

Decisions are based on factors such as:

- Required on all projects
- Demands from donors
- Government rules
- Project plans
- Evaluation strategies
- Undertaken as best practice

“Under the current drive for Results Based Management, we are pushing our staff to focus more keenly on the outcome level. They have been stuck in the activity-to-output process for too long.”

Tracking outputs and outcomes

Question: Do you aim to evaluate outputs or outcomes?

Most respondents indicated that they look to evaluate both outputs and outcomes. Some organizations are able to carry out the full M&E cycle from monitoring outputs to evaluating outcomes to assessing impact. Issues such as lack of availability of data or differing donor requirements can constrain this.



Evaluation

management and
approaches




Most large organizations have a mixed approach to managing evaluations in order to combine the advantages of centralized and decentralized approaches.

Institutional arrangements

Question: Which parts of the organization are responsible for monitoring and evaluation (country office, program team, HQ evaluation specialists, independent evaluation office, external contractors, others)? Can you describe how the overall evaluation work in the organization is divided between these different groups either by type of work or by amount of work in the area of evaluation?

Evaluations can be conducted at different levels including evaluations by the primary beneficiaries themselves, evaluations by the program teams, and evaluations by a central evaluation team. They can also be undertaken by an independent evaluation office or commissioned from consultants, though less than half of respondents reported that they always or very frequently do so. Nevertheless, the more frequently used evaluation approaches include commissioned consultancy evaluations and program team evaluations. Fully independent evaluations and self evaluation by grantees are less often used.

Figure 4: Frequency of use of monitoring mechanisms
(multiple responses allowed)



Source: *Monitoring and Evaluation in the Development Sector*, KPMG International, 2014.

Question: Which mechanisms are used to conduct formal evaluations?

Around a third of the respondents indicated that a central evaluation team or department would evaluate projects very frequently, or always. This approach brings greater accountability to the evaluation process as well as a basis to compare performance across the organization. It should also allow the deployment of greater expertise.

“Evaluation is decentralized to teams and commissioned and managed by them with advisory support from the central evaluation department.”

Question: How does this distribution mirror the way in which the organization is structured (e.g., centralized, decentralized)?

Generally, the responses confirm that organizational structure mirrors the centralized and decentralized aspects of the M&E system. The majority of respondents focused on the decentralized nature of both their evaluation approach and their organizational delivery model with some notable exceptions.

Change in M&E approaches

Question: What is changing in your organization's approach to monitoring and evaluation?

Some of the key messages are a growing demand for evidence, strengthening of the evaluation system, improved monitoring, and increased interest in impact measurement. There is a growing emphasis on building the evidence base for programs through evaluation in many organizations. Some respondents gave a strong account of having deliberately embedded a results-based approach in their organization.

Growing Demand for Evidence

- "Recognition of the need for an evidence base is increasing."
- "Demand for regular reporting to the board is increasing."
- "Internally we are sick of not being able to say what difference we have made."
- "A shift towards greater focus on building the evidence base."

Evaluation Systems Strengthening

- "We have pushed up both the floors and ceilings of evaluation standards in the organization. What was previously our ceiling (gold standard) is now our floor (minimum standard)."
- "A more strategic approach is planned so evidence gaps are identified more systematically and better covered by evaluation."

Improved Monitoring Approaches

- "We are working on getting more sophisticated in our use of monitoring data so we have better and timelier feedback information loops."
- "We are implementing changes to improve monitoring and how we use monitoring data."

More Focus on Impact Measurement

- "Evaluation has moved from only addressing performance issues to addressing impact issues."
- "We have identified some innovative programs which we design with leading universities or academics where we feel the contribution to global knowledge is important, and where the rigor of the design and M&E needs to be top notch."


“Every key person in the program is involved in ensuring that implementation of research projects is geared towards realizing the impact we are seeking to achieve and they monitor and collect evidence of outputs and feed them to the M&E section.”

Evaluation methodologies

Question: What type of evaluation does your organization currently use and how frequently?

Project evaluations are the most frequently used compared to other methodologies. Impact, sector, and risk evaluations are used relatively rarely in most organizations.

Figure 5: “Always” or “Very frequently” used evaluation types
(multiple responses allowed)




Source: *Monitoring and Evaluation in the Development Sector*, KPMG International, 2014.

Question: Which type of evaluation would you like your organization to do more of?

Few techniques are considered to be overused. Respondents report that there is a need to increase the use of country program, sector, participatory, and impact evaluations. The cost of certain types of evaluations can also impact choice.

Figure 6: “Underused” or “Very underused” evaluation types
(multiple responses allowed)



Source: *Monitoring and Evaluation in the Development Sector*, KPMG International, 2014.

Evaluation techniques


Question: Which evaluation techniques does your organization currently use, and how frequently?

The survey encountered a divergence in the frequency of techniques used for evaluation, with relatively low emphasis on quantified techniques which involve a counterfactual analysis with potential attribution of impact. This is understandable, but does reflect the challenge of quantified reporting of impact in the development field. Techniques such as tracking a theory of change and 'results chains' are more frequently used and will give some explanation of how interventions are having an impact.

Performance indicators and logical frameworks are the most frequently used techniques. Organizations are not frequently using techniques of SROI, Cost Benefit Analysis, and Return on Investment.

Figure 7: "Very Frequently" or "Always" used evaluation techniques

(multiple responses allowed)



Source: *Monitoring and Evaluation in the Development Sector*, KPMG International, 2014.



Strengths and weaknesses of evaluation


“For us, evaluation is a work in progress.”

Question: What would you say are the main strengths and weaknesses of your organizational approach to evaluation?

Although there is high confidence in the rigor of measurement for evaluation, there are perceived weaknesses in other areas. A lack of financial resources is perceived as a major challenge to improving evaluation systems. Most respondents (61 percent) indicate strong external scrutiny as a major strength. No other feature was reported as a major strength by the majority of respondents. Three major weaknesses were identified by at least 40 percent of respondents in the areas of measurement, timeliness, and, most commonly, overall feedback mechanisms.

Figure 8: "Weaknesses" or "Major Weaknesses" and "Strengths" or "Major Strengths" of Evaluation

(multiple responses allowed)



Source: *Monitoring and Evaluation in the Development Sector*, KPMG International, 2014.



Use of new technology




The use of new technology in M&E appears to lag behind other sectors of development which have more readily adopted new technologies including mobile-based solutions, crowd-sourcing, and location-based reporting applications. Organizations appear to be limited in their use of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) enabled tools due to challenges accessing data and getting meaningful information from the analysis provided by these tools.

“The use of big data is a great idea but our staff are cynical about the reliability and veracity of government generated data in poorly governed countries.”

Question: Which information and communication technology enabled tools do you use to collect, manage and analyze data for monitoring and evaluation purposes?

The extent of new technology applications in development evaluation is as yet in its relative infancy. Data techniques are “rarely” or “never” used by the majority of respondents (see Figure 9), with Web-based surveys being the most frequently used technique. Some organizations are also developing data entry systems using tablets and mobile phones. Accessing data is a major challenge for a majority of respondents.

Figure 9: “Rarely” or “Never” used ICT enabled tools
(multiple responses allowed)



Source: *Monitoring and Evaluation in the Development Sector*, KPMG International, 2014.

Roadblocks to using technology

Question: What would you say are the main challenges and problems in introducing data analytics and “big data” into your evaluation system?

Access to expertise, cost of data management and analysis, ease of data accessibility and standardization, and the use of technology by beneficiaries in the field were identified as key factors that impeded greater adoption of technology.

Figure 10: “Major” or “Substantial” challenges in introducing data analytics and “big data”
(multiple responses allowed)



Source: *Monitoring and Evaluation in the Development Sector*, KPMG International, 2014.

Evaluation

feedback loops


“The better the evaluation product and the more stakeholder involvement during the process, the better the uptake at all levels.”

A commonly expressed concern about evaluation is that the feedback loops are very slow. By the time a particular intervention has been implemented and evaluated, the organizational priorities and approaches may have moved on, meaning the relevance of evaluation is marginal. For this reason, it may be better to give more priority and resources on effective monitoring than on ex post evaluation.

Question: How effective would you say the feedback mechanisms are between evaluation findings and operational performance/strategy?

Analyzing feedback is generally scored as poor or variable in the majority of cases. In four of the five categories, more than half the responses were “poor” or “variable.” The score for “internalizing evaluation feedback” is, however, less negative than the more detailed examples, which focus on what would be involved in generating such feedback.

Figure 11: “Poor” or “Variable” assessments of feedback mechanisms
(multiple responses allowed)



Source: *Monitoring and Evaluation in the Development Sector*, KPMG International, 2014.


Timeliness of evaluations

Question: How long does it take for the results of an evaluation to result in improvements in current and future programs?

Most respondents (66 percent) felt that it would take less than a year for the results of an evaluation to lead to improvements. Few respondents identified timeliness as a strength of their evaluation system. It is important to appreciate that the question refers not to the whole project cycle, but only to the period between a completed evaluation and the lessons from that evaluation being applied at a project level.


Figure 12: Time for evaluation results to lead to performance improvements

(numbers do not sum to 100 due to rounding)

Source: *Monitoring and Evaluation in the Development Sector*, KPMG International, 2014.

Sample reasons for length of time of feedback loops:

- Multicountry/Multilingual projects take longer to absorb the lessons of particular evaluations, especially when considering complex projects
- Meta-evaluations on a given sector or a particular approach are undertaken on a five-year cycle so the lesson learning and policy feedback loop can take that entire length of time.



Resources

for monitoring and evaluation


A common theme of a number of questions in the survey is that lack of resources is a major constraint or challenge.

Availability of M&E resources

Question: What proportion of program budget would you say is being spent on monitoring and evaluation?

The majority of respondents (53 percent) stated that levels of resourcing for evaluation were 2 percent or less of the program budget.

Figure 13: Proportion of program budget being spent on M&E
(Estimated spending on M&E as % of program budget)




(numbers do not sum to 100 due to rounding)

Source: *Monitoring and Evaluation in the Development Sector*, KPMG International, 2014.

Question: What would you say are the main challenges and problems in improving your evaluation system?

Lack of financial resources is the most frequently cited challenge to strengthening the evaluation system. Nearly a quarter of respondents estimated the evaluation budgets to be 1 percent or less of program spend. The share of respondents estimating the evaluation budget at more than 5 percent of program budget is fewer than one in five (19 percent).

Figure 14: Main challenges and problems in improving evaluation systems
(multiple responses allowed)



Source: *Monitoring and Evaluation in the Development Sector*, KPMG International, 2014.

“Availability of financial resources is usually a challenge which in turn has consequences in the application of more robust methodologies for better evaluation practices.”

Role models in M&E

Although responses to a question about role models were quite varied, multilateral banks and the health sector were consistently ranked as leaders in the development sector.

Question: In your opinion which organization has the strongest monitoring and evaluation approach?

The most admired organizations were praised with regard to the strength, quality, and data-driven nature of their approach to monitoring and evaluation by their peers.



Methodology

Case Study:

Outcome Mapping

Outcome Mapping (OM) is an alternative planning and results evaluation system for complex development interventions. Key to the success of this system has been the ability to adapt it in creative ways to meet an individual program's needs.

What is it?

One of the most important attributes of the OM method is its ability to track a breadth of activities – both planned and opportunistic, and capture a range of results – from the incremental to the transformative, across a variety of stakeholders. This is in contrast to more conventional systems of results measurement, where the focus is narrowed to a task of measuring planned activities, and using predefined indicators to chart high-level results.

How does it work?

OM begins by identifying “boundary partners”: influential people, organizations, institutions or other entities with whom a program will work to achieve its goals. These partners might be politicians, community leaders or the media.

Progress towards goals is then tracked in terms of observed changes in behavior among these boundary partners. Practitioners are asked to record small changes that they observe every day in “outcome journals,” which enables them to capture a range of evidence from the seemingly small to the transformative. This also allows practitioners the freedom to capture whatever information best illustrates the change – as opposed to collecting information against specific predefined indicators, as is done with a log-frame.



Adapting OM: The Accountability in Tanzania (AcT) Program

Funded by DFID and hosted by KPMG in East Africa, the US\$52 million Accountability in Tanzania (AcT) program provides a useful example of how OM methodologies can be applied creatively to facilitate flexible, impact-driven development programming. AcT provides flexible grant funding to 26 civil society organization (CSOs) working to improve accountability of government in Tanzania.

In order to facilitate its innovative approach to grant-making, AcT has adapted outcome mapping to meet its needs in a variety of ways.

- AcT developed new results measurement indicators that allowed it to merge its CSO-level OM data with the program's overall logframe in order to demonstrate, from top to bottom, how change actually happens.
- AcT developed a database through which to manage its OM results. Database analysis has allowed AcT to develop a clearer view of the results pathways for the program, report results easily to DFID, and develop much more precise progress markers to facilitate further learning.
- OM has provided an effective basis for structuring and monitoring AcT's partnerships with CSOs – in order to gauge the extent to which AcT support is helping to achieve a strengthened civil society in Tanzania.



Survey

methodology


In carrying out this survey, we define monitoring as the activity that is concerned with the review and assessment of progress during implementation of development activities and projects. This provides ongoing feedback to managers and funders about performance – what is working and what is not working, and needs correcting.

In contrast, “evaluation is the episodic assessment of the change in targeted results that can be attributed to the program/project intervention, or the analysis of inputs and activities to determine their contribution to results.”¹


KPMG’s Monitoring and Evaluation Survey reflects the responses of 35 participants during February through April 2014. Respondents’ organizations are responsible for over US\$100 billion of development spend.²

The purpose of the survey was to identify current trends and opinions of those who are leading the agenda within key development institutions. The survey was completed using an online survey tool, supplemented in most cases by a telephone interview to clarify responses and allow opportunity for dialogue. The following types of organizations participated.

Participant Type



Role



■ Bilateral ■ Multilateral ■ Philanthropic ■ Funder ■ Implementer ■ Both Funder and Implementer

Source: *Monitoring and Evaluation in the Development Sector*, KPMG International, 2014.

¹ <http://info.worldbank.org/etools/docs/library/243395/M2S2%20Overview%20of%20Monitoring%20and%20evaluation%20%20NJ.pdf> slide, 15 March 2014.

² KPMG estimate based on published information

Glossary

Accountability	The obligation to account for activities, accept responsibility for them, and to disclose the results in a transparent manner
Baseline Study	Analysis of the current situation to identify the starting point for a project or program
Beneficiary Feedback	Monitoring through obtaining information from the primary stakeholders who benefit or are intended to benefit from the project or program
Compliance	Evaluation to comply with internal or external rules or regulations
Cost Benefit Analysis	Quantification of costs and benefits producing a discounted cash flow with an internal rate of return or net present value
Counterfactual Study	A study to estimate what would have happened in the absence of the project or program
Evaluation	An assessment, as systematic and objective as possible, of an ongoing or completed project, program or policy, its design, implementation and results
Focus Group	A focus group is a form of qualitative research in which a group of people are asked about their perceptions, opinions, beliefs, and attitudes
Funder	An organization which provides financial support to a second party to implement a project or program for the benefit of third parties
ICT Enabled Visualization	Use of computer graphics to create visual means of communication and consultation with stakeholders and beneficiaries
Impact Measurement	The process of identifying the anticipated or actual impacts of a development intervention, on those social, economic and environmental factors which the intervention is designed to affect or may inadvertently affect
Impact Evaluation	Assesses the changes that can be attributed to a particular intervention, such as a project, program or policy, both the intended ones, as well as unintended ones
Implementer	The organization which is responsible for delivery/management of a development intervention
Independent Evaluation	An evaluation which is organizationally independent from the implementing and funding organizations
Key Performance Indicators	Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) define a set of values used to measure against. An organization may use KPIs to evaluate its success, or to evaluate the success of a particular activity in which it is engaged
Logical Framework	A tool which sets out inputs, outputs, outcomes and impact for an intervention with indicators of achievement, means of verification and assumptions for each level
Monitoring	The process of gathering information about project performance and progress during its implementation phase
Open Source Database	Open source software is computer software that is distributed along with its source code – the code that is used to create the software – under a special software license
Outcome Mapping	An alternative planning and results evaluation system for complex development interventions which tracks planned and unplanned outcomes (See Case Study)
Participatory Evaluation	Provides for the active involvement of those with a stake in the program: providers, partners, beneficiaries, and any other interested parties. All involved decide how to frame the questions used to evaluate the program, and all decide how to measure outcomes and impact

Participant Analysis	A range of well-defined, though variable methods: informal interviews, direct observation, participation in the life of the group, collective discussions, analyses of personal documents produced within the group, self-analysis, results from activities undertaken offline or online, and life histories
Performance Benchmarks	Benchmarking is the process of comparing processes and performance metrics to industry bests or best practices from other industries. Dimensions typically measured are quality, time and cost
Portfolio Performance	Metrics which enable organizations to measure the performance of different elements of their portfolio and the portfolio overall
Primary Beneficiary	The individual people that the project is intended to assist
Program Team	The department or team which is responsible and accountable for a particular project or intervention
Project	A discrete set of activities which are generally approved as a package or series of packages, with defined objectives
Project Evaluation	An evaluation which examines the performance and impact of a single intervention or project
Proxy Indicators	An appropriate indicator that is used to represent a less easily measurable one
Randomized Control Trials	An evaluation which assigns at random a control group and a treatment group. Comparison of the performance of the two groups provides a measure of true impact
Results Chain	A Results Chain is a simplified picture of a program, initiative, or intervention. It depicts the logical relationships between the resources invested, activities that take place, and the sequence of outputs, outcomes and impacts that result
Results Attribution	Evaluation techniques which attribute the specific outcomes and impacts of an intervention
Return on Investment	A measure of the financial or economic rate of return, typically calculated through discounted case flow analysis as an internal rate of return
Risk Analysis	Assessment of the probability and impact of the risks affecting an intervention or project
Risk Evaluation	A component of risk assessment in which judgments are made about the significance and acceptability of risk
Sector Evaluation	Evaluation of a set of interventions within a particular sector such as education, health, etc.
Self Evaluation	An evaluation which is undertaken by the team which is responsible for the implementation of that intervention
Social Return on Investment (SROI)	SROI is an approach to understanding and managing the value of the social, economic and environmental outcomes created by an activity or an organization. It is based on a set of principles that are applied within a framework
Thematic Evaluation	Evaluation of a set of interventions within a particular thematic approach such as governance or gender
Theory of Change	An explicit presentation of the assumptions about how changes are expected to happen within any particular context and in relation to a particular intervention
Value for Money	"The optimal use of resources to achieve intended outcomes" ³

³ <http://www.nao.org.uk/successful-commissioning/general-principles/value-for-money/assessing-value-for-money/>, 23 August 2014.

Bookshelf

Thought Leadership



2013 Change Readiness Index

The Change Readiness Index assesses the ability of 90 countries to manage change and cultivate the resulting opportunity.



Future State 2030: The global megatrends shaping governments

This report identifies nine global megatrends that are most salient to the future of governments. While their individual impacts will likely be far-reaching, the trends are highly interrelated and thus demand a combined and coordinated set of responses.

Issues Monitor



Issues Monitor – A greener agenda for international development

This publication explores the nexus between climate change and development – an undeniable link that demands greater alignment and integration of both development and climate change agendas in order to help catalyze real and sustainable change around the world.



Issues Monitor – Bridging the gender gap

This publication explores the issue of gender equality - something that remains elusive in many parts of the world, but is vital for economic growth and development of society.



Issues Monitor – Aid effectiveness

Developing countries have long depended on humanitarian and development aid provided by donor countries and organizations. The economic downturn and the resulting strain on budgets have put donors under extra pressure to demonstrate results.



Issues Monitor – Ensuring food security

As people in developing countries struggle to purchase enough food to fulfill their daily nutrition requirements, the number who continue to go hungry remains high. Climate change and crop diversion to biofuels have increased pressure on food production, contributing to higher worldwide food prices. More global financial support to strengthen supply systems is required to help ensure that every person has sufficient access to food.

Other publications



Sustainable Insight: Unlocking the value of social investment

This report is intended to help corporate responsibility managers and others involved in designing and delivering social investments to overcome some of the challenges to measuring and reporting on social programs.



You can't do it alone

This article explores the various demand side and supply side measures to tackle the youth unemployment crisis in both developed and developing markets.



Global Chair
Government & Infrastructure
Nick Chism
T: +44 20 7311 1000
E: nick.chism@kpmg.co.uk

Contact IDAS

Global Chair
Timothy A.A. Stiles
T: +1 212 872 5955
E: taastiles@kpmg.com

IDAS Center of Excellence
Trevor Davies
T: +1 202 533 3109
E: tdavies2@kpmg.com

Central America
Alfredo Artiles
T: +505 2274 4265
E: aartiles@kpmg.com

CIS
Andrew Coxshall
T: +995322950716
E: acoxshall@kpmg.com

East Asia and Pacific Islands
Mark Jerome
T: +856 219 00344
E: mjerome@kpmg.com

Eastern Europe
Aleksandar Bucic
T: +381112050652
E: abucic@kpmg.com

European Union Desk
Mercedes Sanchez-Varela
T: +32 270 84349
E: msanchezvarela@kpmg.com

Francophone Africa
Thierry Colatrella
T: +33 1 55686099
E: tcolatrella@kpmg.fr

Middle East
Suhael Ahmed
T: +97165742214
E: suhaelahmed1@kpmg.com

North America
Mark Fitzgerald
T: +1 703 286 6577
E: markfitzgerald@kpmg.com

South America
Ieda Novais
T: +551121833185
E: inovais@kpmg.com.br

South Asia
Narayanan Ramaswamy
T: +91 443 914 5200
E: narayananr@kpmg.com

Sub-Saharan Africa
Charles Appleton
T: +254 20 2806000
E: charlesappleton@kpmg.co.ke

United Nations Desk
Emad Bibawi
T: +1 212 954 2033
E: ebibawi@kpmg.com

Western Europe
Marianne Fallon
T: +44 20 73114989
E: marianne.fallon@kpmg.co.uk

kpmg.com/socialmedia



kpmg.com/app



The information contained herein is of a general nature and is not intended to address the circumstances of any particular individual or entity. Although we endeavor to provide accurate and timely information, there can be no guarantee that such information is accurate as of the date it is received or that it will continue to be accurate in the future. No one should act on such information without appropriate professional advice after a thorough examination of the particular situation.

© 2014 KPMG International Cooperative ("KPMG International"), a Swiss entity. Member firms of the KPMG network of independent firms are affiliated with KPMG International. KPMG International provides no client services. No member firm has any authority to obligate or bind KPMG International or any other member firm vis-à-vis third parties, nor does KPMG International have any such authority to obligate or bind any member firm. All rights reserved.

The KPMG name, logo and "cutting through complexity" are registered trademarks or trademarks of KPMG International.

Designed by Evalueserve.

Publication name: Monitoring and Evaluation in the Development Sector

Publication number: 131584

Publication date: August 2014