Notes

Chapter 2
Our overall approach to impact assessment

1 This chapter draws heavily on the literature review and preparatory reports written by Raul Hopkins and Elsa Dawson and an interim progress report by Floris Blankenberg, Margaret Newens and Chris Roche, published in Oakley et al. (1998).

2 I am grateful to Fred Wessels of Oxfam GB for this rewording of Paul Willot's work on auto-evaluation (Willot 1985).

3 See Martha Alter Chen and Elizabeth Dunn (1997).

4 I am grateful to Bridget Walker of Oxfam GB for this observation.

Chapter 3 Designing an impact assessment process


2 Personal communication from Bridget Walker of Oxfam GB.

3 David Hulme notes that one reason why multiple regression has been rarely used, even in the area of microfinance impact assessment which one might think is more easily quantifiable, is the ‘enormous demands for data on other possible causal factors’, and the huge expense and technical expertise that this requires (Hulme 1997).

Chapter 4 Choosing tools and methods

1 A One Stop Shop in Britain generally provides a range of services and goods. This may include advice on employment, social services, benefits, or legal advice, as well as sales of second-hand clothes and other items. Advice workers are normally specialists in particular fields such as law or welfare benefits and offer support to anyone who seeks it.
The Phoenix Club is a member-led drop-in centre for residents suffering from mental health problems which is based at the offices of the Matson Neighbourhood Project.

For more information on how to organise a training session for semi-structured interviewing, including specific exercises, see *Participatory Learning in Action: A Trainer's Guide* published by the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), pp. 73–79.

The topics discussed are based on Chen and Mahmud's conceptual framework to assess changes in women's lives (Chen and Mahmud 1995), which identifies three pathways to empowerment (material, perceptual, and relational).


Social mapping is another PRA method, in which participants are asked to draw a map of the dwellings in the community and to name the household or individual who live there, or to indicate details about the status of each household.

Bridget Walker, personal communication.


The study has also calculated the direct and indirect economic impacts of projects.

See Dinwiddy and Teal (1995) for more information on how these are calculated as well as for general material on cost-benefit analysis.

I am very grateful to Sabina Alkire for this section, which heavily 'borrows' from her PhD thesis (Alkire 1999).

The IRR in this case has no distributional weights as all the projects target the same socio-economic group.

**Chapter 5  Impact assessment and emergencies**

These include a report on a workshop, 'Managing Emergency Humanitarian Aid evaluation: Lessons from Experience', held with AusAID support (Apthorpe and Nevile 1998), and a report entitled 'Good Practice in Evaluating Humanitarian Aid', submitted by DANIDA to the DAC Working Party on Aid Evaluation (Hallam and Borton 1998).
Notes

2 The SPHERE project is an effort by a large number of international agencies to draft a humanitarian charter and to identify a set of standards and best practice in delivery of services to disaster victims.


4 Bridget Walker, personal communication.

5 See also David Bryer and Ed Cairns (1997).

Chapter 6 Impact assessment and advocacy

1 Much of this chapter is based on an article entitled 'Assessing the impact of advocacy work' by Alex Bush and Chris Roche, published in *Appropriate Technology* Vol. 24, 1997 and preceding discussions at a Development Studies Association NGO study group meeting in July 1997. It also draws on work by Jim Coe of Oxfam's Campaigns department and detailed comments on an earlier draft by Peter van Tuijl of Novib.

2 I am grateful to Peter van Tuijl for the ideas upon which this definition is based.


4 Evaluation conducted by Development Initiatives.

5 Letter from Kenneth Clarke, Chancellor of the Exchequer during Oxfam's debt campaign, to Bob Hammond, Oxfam Constituency Contact, in September 1997.

6 Letter from Bob Hammond, Oxfam Constituency Contact, October 1997.


8 See Adrian Jackson (1997) for a description on the use of legislative theatre in the UK.

9 See Mavrocdatos (1997) on the uses of theatre for participatory monitoring.

Chapter 7  Impact assessment and organisations

1  This chapter in addition to the case-study material also draws upon papers and reports produced during the course of the research, notably Newens and Roche (1997) and Blankenberg, Newens and Roche (1998).

2  This scale builds on the ideas of Norman Uphoff (1987) in his field methodology for participatory self-evaluation.

3  For more on these ratios for credit programmes see Chapter 4 and Annex 2 of Johnson and Rogaly (1997).

4  Those who have any doubt about this, see Perera’s analysis of the relationship between Sarvadoya and its donors (1997).

5  For an assessment of the relevance of social auditing to Oxfam see Dawson (1998).
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Appendix 2: Contact addresses and material available from the case-study participants

Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Materials:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Centre for Youth and Social Development, India

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Materials:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### Environment and Development Activities Zimbabwe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address:</th>
<th>Materials:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENDA</td>
<td>King, B, Mawoneke, S (1998) Impact Assessment Case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.O. Box 3492</td>
<td>Study undertaken by Environment and Development Activities (ENDA) – Zimbabwe, paper prepared for the Impact Assessment Workshop in Stanton, UK 23–26 November 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fondación para la cooperación y el Desarrollo Comunal de El Salvador (CORDES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address:</th>
<th>Materials:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apartado postal 5841</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Salvador</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Gonoshahajjo Sangstha, Bangladesh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address:</th>
<th>Materials:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41 Sir Syed Ahmed Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block-A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohammadpur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhaka 1207</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPO Box No. 3535</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhaka, Bangladesh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Matson Neighbourhood Project, UK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Address:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Materials:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Nijera Kori, Bangladesh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Address:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P.O. Box 5015 New Market, Dhaka-5 Road No. 4a House No. 40a Dhanmandi Dhaka Bangladesh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NOVIB, The Netherlands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Address:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PO Box 30919 2500 GX Den Haag The Netherlands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Oxfam GB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Address:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oxfam GB 274 Banbury Road Oxford OX2 7DZ UK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Oxfam GB in Ghana

**Address:**
- Oxfam Ghana
- PO Box 432
- Tamale, N/R
- Ghana

**Materials:**

## Oxfam GB in Ikafe, Uganda

**Address:**
- c/o Oxfam GB
- PO Box 6228
- Kampala
- Uganda

**Materials:**

## Oxfam GB in Pakistan

**Address:**
- Oxfam GB
- F-191 CITIZEN COLONY
- Hyderabad
- Sindh
- Pakistan

**Materials:**
### Appendix 2

#### Proshiaka, Bangladesh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PO Box 3149 Ramna Dhaka 1000 Bangladesh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Wajir Pastoralist Development Programme, Kenya

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Nairobi Kenya
Appendix 3: Participants of the impact assessment workshop November 1998

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sabina Alkire</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Allcock</td>
<td>Oxfam GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floris Blankenberg</td>
<td>SNV, The Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Anup Kumar Dash</td>
<td>UTKAL UNIVERSITY, Orissa, India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Pran Gopal Das</td>
<td>CYSD, Orissa, India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsa Dawson</td>
<td>Oxfam GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohammed Elmi</td>
<td>Oxfam GB in Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yvonne Es</td>
<td>Novib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolette Etienne</td>
<td>Oxfam GB in Haiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Gale</td>
<td>The Gloucester Neighbourhood Project Network, UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Garland</td>
<td>Matson Neighbourhood Project, Gloucester, UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yanci Urbina Gonzalez</td>
<td>Oxfam GB in El Salvador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Gonzalez</td>
<td>CORDES, El Salvador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anamul Haque</td>
<td>Oxfam GB in Bangladesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. A.M. Muazzam Hussain</td>
<td>BRAC, Bangladesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Jarret</td>
<td>Matson Neighbourhood Project, Gloucester, UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Jolly M.C</td>
<td>CYSD, Orissa, India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamal Kar</td>
<td>Development Consultant, Calcutta, India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conchita Lloret</td>
<td>Oxfam GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sthembile Mawoneke</td>
<td>ENDA, Zimbabwe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Morrow</td>
<td>Oxfam GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paresh Motla</td>
<td>Oxfam GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abu Nasar</td>
<td>PROSHIKA, Bangladesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidayat Narajo</td>
<td>Oxfam GB in Pakistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koos Neefjes</td>
<td>Oxfam GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrie Papma</td>
<td>NOVIB, The Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Pugansoa</td>
<td>Oxfam GB in Ghana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nafisatu Quarshie</td>
<td>Oxfam GB in Ghana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrique Reyes</td>
<td>CORDES, El Salvador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Roche</td>
<td>Oxfam GB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 4: List of acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAIN</td>
<td>Action Africa in Need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAC</td>
<td>Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee, Bangladesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Cost-benefit analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Community-based organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORDES</td>
<td>The Foundation for Co-operation and Community Development in El Salvador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYSD</td>
<td>Centre for Youth and Social Development, Orissa, India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>Development Assistance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>Department For International Development, UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIA</td>
<td>Environmental impact assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENDA</td>
<td>Environment and Development Activities, Zimbabwe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSS</td>
<td>Gonoshahajjo Sangstha, Bangladesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INGO</td>
<td>International non-government organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISODEC</td>
<td>Integrated Social Development Centre, Ghana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITDG</td>
<td>Intermediate Technology Development Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JRS</td>
<td>Jesuit Refugee Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFA</td>
<td>Logical Framework Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LNGO</td>
<td>Local non-government organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNP</td>
<td>Matson Neighbourhood Project, UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGND</td>
<td>Northern Ghana Development Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-government organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NK</td>
<td>Nijera Kori, Bangladesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAR</td>
<td>Participatory action research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLA</td>
<td>Participatory learning and action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPA</td>
<td>Participatory poverty assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRA</td>
<td>Participatory rural appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMPAI</td>
<td>Resource Management and Policy Analysis Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRA</td>
<td>Rapid rural appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCBA</td>
<td>Social cost-benefit analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIA</td>
<td>Social impact assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5: Glossary

The following terms are defined as they are employed in this book, together with an indication of how they tend to be used in common practice. There is no general consensus on these issues; often the terms are used interchangeably, or their meanings are hotly contested (not least by specialists in evaluation!).

Aim: the overall and ultimate purpose that a project or programme seeks to achieve, often expressed in terms of desired changes in people's lives. Often used interchangeably with goal or purpose, and sometimes as the equivalent of the long-term objective.

Activities: what is done, or those actions that are actually undertaken, in a given project or programme.

Assumptions: estimations of how external factors in the environment, such as economic or political trends, will influence the results of a project or programme. Often used interchangeably with hypotheses, and based on an analysis of the context in which a project or programme takes place. Many argue that this should be the starting point for project planning and impact assessment, rather than being added on as an after-thought.

Consistency: the degree to which the process or methods adopted by a given project or programme are in harmony with what the programme achieves or seeks to achieve.

Effectiveness: the extent to which intended outputs, results, or outcomes have been realised.

Effects: the results or outputs of a given set of activities. These can sometimes be the same as a project's short-term objectives or its outcomes. Often used interchangeably with outputs and outcomes.

Efficiency: a measure of the relationship between the inputs or resources invested in a given project or programme, and the outputs and
outcomes achieved. Could the same results have been achieved for less input, or could more results have been achieved with the same input? Or, more rarely, could more resources have achieved disproportionately greater results? Often very difficult to measure.

Evaluation: traditionally refers to the assessment, at the end of the life of a project or programme or several years after, of its impact, effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, and sustainability. It is often distinguished from monitoring by an emphasis on outcomes and impact, on underlying assumptions, and on learning for future and broader policy purposes beyond the particular project or programme that is being assessed. Recently evaluation has also been used to refer to reviews undertaken during the lifetime of a project. The distinction between monitoring and evaluation has become more blurred as the credibility of one-off external evaluations has been questioned, and interest in more continuous forms of organisational learning has grown.

Goal: usually means the overall and ultimate purpose that a project or programme seeks to achieve, often expressed in terms of desired changes in people’s lives. Often used interchangeably with aim or purpose, or as the equivalent of the long-term objective of a project or programme.

Hypotheses: estimations of how external factors in the environment will influence the results of the project or programme. Often used interchangeably with assumptions, and based on an analysis of the context in which a project or programme operates. Many argue that this should be the starting point for project planning and impact assessment, rather than being added on as an after-thought.

Impact: lasting or significant changes – positive or negative, intended or not – in people’s lives, brought about by a given action or series of actions. Traditionally only sustainable or lasting changes were seen to constitute impact. In this book we also use the word impact to refer to changes which people may see as significant but which are only temporary. Often, but not always, equivalent to the purpose, goal, aim, or long-term objective of a project or programme, or the indicators by which these things are measured.

Impact assessment: the systematic analysis of the lasting or significant changes – positive or negative, intended or not – in people’s lives, brought about by a given action or series of actions. Traditionally associated with assessments undertaken (a) before a project or programme starts, at the appraisal stage, to determine likely future impacts – normally for the purposes of avoiding negative environmental and social impacts – and (b) as a specific type or element of an
evaluation, undertaken after completion. Recently it has been seen as a more continuous and integral part of the project cycle; see monitoring.

Impact chain: a description of the linkages between what goes into a given project or programme (i.e. the inputs), the activities and process that are undertaken as a result, and the results of those process and activities, often described in the form of outputs, outcomes, or impact.

Indicator: the evidence or ‘signpost’ which shows whether an activity, objective, or aim has been achieved or is on its way to being achieved. An indicator may refer directly to the activity or objective in question (e.g. the indicator of the success of a project which aims to enable people to eat more rice would be that people actually eat more rice), or it may be a proxy or indirect measure (e.g. measuring upper-arm circumference as an indicator of malnutrition). It is important that the two are not confused; otherwise effort will be diverted into achieving change in the indicator, whether or not this is appropriate to the objective (e.g. improving muscle bulk in the upper arm, as opposed to dealing with the causes of malnutrition).

Inputs: the financial and human resources necessary to undertake the activities of a project or programme. Estimates of inputs often fail to include the time, effort, and energy that are not provided by funding agencies and donors.

Longitudinal approach: an approach to impact assessment which seeks to track change throughout the life-time of a given project or programme. This is often done through repeatedly assessing changes in the fortunes of the same individuals or groups.

Monitoring: regular and on-going assessment of progress made during the lifetime of a project, to enable adjustments to be made. Traditionally referred only to the assessment of whether a project was on track in terms of its planned activities and outputs, but is increasingly employed to refer to the tracking of all aspects of a project, including the scanning of the external environment and the impact achieved (whether intended or unintended): hence the increasing use of the phrase ‘impact monitoring’.

Objectives: the intended achievements of the activities of a project or programme in the short, medium, or long term. Long-term objectives are often used as the equivalent of aims or goals. Short-term and medium-term objectives are often used as the equivalent of outputs or outcomes.

Outputs: the immediate results or effects of a given activity. Often used interchangeably with outcomes, effects, or results.
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Outcomes: what will occur if the outputs are actually used or sustained. Often used interchangeably with outputs, effects, or results, and sometimes with impact.

Project: a time-bound collection of activities with a distinct purpose.

Programme: a collection of projects, grouped together to achieve greater impact, so that 'the whole is greater than the sum of the parts'. For example, a programme in a particular geographic area, or one which works with a particular group of people, will often consist of a number of specific projects, which may be defined by sector or activity, e.g. credit, agriculture, health, etc., or by group or location, e.g. a specific village project. Together these projects will normally seek to achieve more than the individual projects; for example, a number of credit projects together may seek not only to deliver direct benefits to their clients, but also to create greater competition in the area and in so doing to undercut existing money-lenders.

Prospective study: the stage of the impact assessment process that is essentially looking forward at the impact that is desired in the future, and considering how that might be assessed. This may occur at the beginning of a project or at any stage during its life, particularly during mid-term reviews or evaluations.

Purpose: the overall and ultimate aim or goal that a project or programme seeks to achieve, often expressed in terms of desired changes in people's lives. Often used interchangeably with goal or aim.

Relevance: the degree to which a project, programme, or process is, or has been, relevant to the needs, aspirations, and desires of those whom it intends to benefit, and the changing context in which they are situated.

Results: often used to mean effects or outputs. Sometimes used to mean anything that happens as the result of a project or programme.

Retrospective study: an impact-assessment exercise, looking back at significant change that has occurred.

Sustainability: the degree to which the financial, organisational, social, political, or environmental benefits of a given project or programme will endure over time.
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