

How to Bring about Change

**Exploring and improving modalities and tools for impact assessment,
nurturing our common understanding of social transformation and change**

CIDSE discussion paper¹, July 2012

Purpose of the document

This discussion paper aims to highlight our concerns about the current aid effectiveness agenda, particularly around the domain of impact assessment, and how it is affecting the outcomes of our work. We aim to use it to enter into a dialogue with our staff, constituencies, donors, partners and beneficiaries about the intended impact of our work which is closely linked to our vision of the social change we want to achieve and in line with our vision and mission as Catholic organisations. Based on evidence (portfolio of examples) we aim to demonstrate our efforts to contribute to the domain of impact assessment from a different perspective. This effort may be partly motivated by our position – as recipients of donors’ funding. Yet if contributing to positive change is the ultimate goal of our and our partner organisations’ work, then the parameters, indicators and the final objectives that we set to determine our impact must be consistent with a vision that is not necessarily compatible with the current development model based on growth.

The development of the aid effectiveness agenda: a critical review

The aid effectiveness agenda grew out of the recognition that official development cooperation policies pursued over the last three decades had not succeeded in eradicating global poverty. The lack of coordination within the aid sector was given a large part of the blame for this failure. However, from our perspective the failure also relates to the inability of the OECD to deliver on their 0.7% ODA commitment, forcing donors to get the maximum value of their limited aid budgets. To overcome this failure in the Paris Declaration (PD) in 2005, nearly 100 signatories – including donor and recipient governments, bilateral and multilateral donor agencies and regional development banks – agreed to fulfill its principles of ownership, alignment, harmonisation, management of results and mutual accountability in their development policies, which mostly sought to reduce poverty by accelerating GDP-measured growth. The Accra Agenda for Action (2008) established and reaffirmed joint principles that became the defining paradigm and the norm regarding aid effectiveness, focusing on the efficiency of aid delivery. Even though the PD principles as guidelines for governmental action can be supported, the approach to focus on aid effectiveness instead of development effectiveness² has been criticised by civil society organisations as it gives precedence to a value for money and a short-term results-oriented approach which is both overly restrictive and hampers efforts to bringing lasting change. The Busan High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness (December 2011) sealed this process with

¹ This discussion paper is a collective contribution of Heads of Programme of CIDSE Member Organisations. Some positions reflected in the document are not necessarily entirely shared by all members of the CIDSE HoP Forum.

² CIDSE, “Development Aid: Compensation for Injustice or Instrument for Justice?” March 2008.

the Busan Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation (BPd)³ that also reflects an effort to deal with the complex development cooperation architecture which no longer includes the traditional Northern donor-driven arrangement, but rather increasingly significant non-traditional providers of development cooperation (including key emerging economies like China and Brazil, as well as the private sector). The Busan partnership also broadens its “focus and attention from aid effectiveness to the challenges of effective development” (BPd § 28), thus moving the focus from a technical aid effectiveness agenda that only considers immediate measures of aid delivery, to one that looks at results as development impacts. Yet the Partnership continues to be strongly embedded in the premise that “development is driven by strong, sustainable and inclusive growth” (BPd § 28a).

This confirms that in spite of some visible changes (acknowledgement and inclusion of key emerging economies and their specific cooperation modalities, such as South-South and triangular cooperation), the aid system is and remains an integral part of the prevailing structures that support/uphold the economic growth paradigm⁴ through its overarching approach: value for money, management for results and funding systems (tied aid, policy conditionality in the provision of aid).

Donors are primarily held to account by their governments and domestic constituencies from which aid money originates. One key condition to ensure that aid money is spent effectively is the development and establishment of rigorous results policies and tools. While the adoption of a results-based approach may ensure that actors involved in providing aid are also accountable, the strong pressure from domestic constituencies often motivates donors to adopt methodologies of project design and measurement (e.g. linear cause-effect methodologies like the log frame) that focus on immediate and quantifiable deliverables, and are less likely to prioritise sustainable, long-term impact.

Moreover, a results-based culture may on the one hand strengthen accountability from recipients to donors, but at the same time will increase the influence that donors have to shape recipients’ agendas. This raises questions about donor accountability to developing countries and whether donors will invest in ways for citizens to hold their own government to account. There is a concern that donor accountability will crowd out everything else.⁵

CIDSE’s response to the aid effectiveness agenda⁶

While much of our own debate on the impact of our work grew out of the Aid Effectiveness agenda, our concerns regarding the impact of our work are whether it upholds the dignity of the human being and leads to visible changes in the lives of poor people, and whether it contributes to human flourishing and the common good rather than reinforcing the primacy of the market and economic

³ Fourth High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness, Busan, South Korea (December 2011): http://www.aideffectiveness.org/busanhl4/images/stories/hlf4/OUTCOME_DOCUMENT_-_FINAL_EN.pdf

⁴ On CIDSE Members’ reflections and concerns about the growth paradigm: See outcome document of the CIDSE conference (13-14 September 2011) “People and Planet First: alternative ideas about development”. http://www.cidse.org/content/publications/rethinking-development/people_and_planet_first.html. This conference is part of a wider focus within the CIDSE network to ‘rethink development’, looking at growth, development paradigms and change. The discussions across the two days built on work that has already begun, and the outcomes of the conference will be taken forward to create a wider discussion around a new paradigm for human and sustainable development, beyond the CIDSE and NGO family. The conference clearly demonstrated that CIDSE does not intend to merely follow international trends, but wants to set the patterns and bring about change.

⁵ Trócaire, *Leading Edge 2020: Critical Thinking on the Future of International Development*, 2011

⁶ As a response to the official aid effectiveness approach, CIDSE has produced an alternative set of principles⁶, in line with a development effectiveness perspective, that guide its development work. We call our work effective if it (1) delivers positive impact on poor people’s lives; (2) is accountable and promotes learning; (3) focuses on equality of opportunity and reaches the poor; (4) is empowering; (5) is carried out in coordination with all stakeholders; (6) is sustainable (‘CIDSE, “Development Aid: Compensation for Injustice or Instrument for Justice?” March 2008.)

growth parameters. In this vision of human flourishing, rooted in Catholic Social Teaching (CST), development is not only defined as aid transfer and characterised by the provision of basic services that are easily monetised and measured. It is seen instead as a process of human growth characterised by the permanent search for dignity, equality, mutual responsibility and the stewardship of our resources and of creation.

This particular concern about the impact of our work reflects our mission to promote justice and global solidarity, fight poverty and inequality, and bring about sustainable development and well being by challenging global structural injustices, and tackling the root causes of poverty.

This quest for change and social transformation is crucial to our work on assessing our impact. It requires us to be critical of the current model of development based on GDP-measured growth that tends to put the economy before humanity and the integrity of creation. In doing so we can draw on CST, which stresses the primacy of human beings and their integral human development, which in turn promotes the well-being of every person and the whole person over society in all its aspects: spiritual, political, economic, social, scientific and cultural⁷, as well as the common good – the sum total of social conditions which allow people, either as groups or as individuals, to fulfil their potential more fully and easily.⁸

Recognising that we act as ‘donors’ when we channel resources from our own community to another, we must be conscious of the part we play in perpetuating models of development that are uncoordinated, ‘northern-led’ and less than transparent. Acknowledging the great weight that is placed on value for money, we must carefully consider the drivers and mechanisms that lead us to adopt and adapt ourselves to the value for money approach that reinforces the market-driven paradigm. We are called upon to showcase positive models of partnership in which the alliance that is formed with communities reflects the values we espouse and takes us beyond a relationship focused on immediate deliverables, where market forces play a role which perpetuates or might even increase injustice. Seeking to create impact is as much about transformative change in the dynamics of human relations and well-being as about change in the material experience of poverty and disadvantage.

For our work to have an impact, i.e. to produce positive change and social transformation, it is essential to tackle the root causes of inequalities as well as the mechanisms that set them in motion, in dialogue and alliance with our partners. Concretely, this entails a holistic and systemic approach that addresses and challenges at the macro level the structures that generate both poverty and inequalities by addressing systems of power, gender inequalities, the development model based on GDP-measured growth, the environmental, resource constraints and climate-change challenges and support/suggest alternatives. It is essential to adopt a multi-level approach that allows us to understand and deconstruct the fabric of inequalities.

1. How we understand change

Whilst every CIDSE agency has its own mission, mandate and way of working, there are a number of features common to how we understand and seek to influence change.

The development programmes of CIDSE Member Organisations (MOs) are rooted in Catholic Social Teaching where the dignity of the human person, the global common good, subsidiarity, sustainability and a clear option for the poor are the fundamental principles that underpin and guide our analysis and actions towards the type of change and social transformation we seek to achieve.

⁷ Cf. *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, 2235

⁸ Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, *Gaudium et Spes*, 26: *AAS* 58 (1966), 1046; cf. *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, 1905-1912; John XXIII, Encyclical Letter *Mater et Magistra*: *AAS* 53 (1961), 417-421; John XXIII, Encyclical Letter *Pacem in Terris*: *AAS* 55 (1963), 272-273; Paul VI, Apostolic Letter *Octogesima Adveniens*, 46: *AAS* 63 (1971), 433-435.

As organisations that have grown from the Church and Church movements that have been major actors in contributing to change, CIDSE MOs try to promote social justice and have a shared commitment to a partnership approach based on solidarity, crucial in a concept of alliance of change that is at the core of our networks' work.

CIDSE agencies look at societal change as change in material conditions ('hard changes') and in non-material conditions ('soft changes') perceived by the people affected as being important to them. The change that CIDSE agencies and our partners promote is based on a rights-based, human dignity and sustainable approach, where people are central and primary active actors of their own change processes. It is about creating the conditions, systems and structures that promote a form of human development, which includes social and environmental sustainability, and is based on the imperatives of social justice. We believe such change require us to not only tackle the symptoms of poverty but also the underlying causes – which are rooted in structural injustices and the historical imbalance of political, economic and social power between the North and the South. This requires the mutual recognition that in working against poverty and injustice in the South, we should also be able to question our roles in our own societies as much as the core mechanisms that generate and reproduce persistent injustice and inequalities.

For the past 50 years, CIDSE MOs, in dialogue with their partners in the South, have learned to identify within society the *structures of sin*⁹, i.e. to examine and transform the social structures of power at the macro (power and its institutional shape and set-up framed in production and exchange systems) and micro levels (mechanisms that rest deep inside societies, particularly at the heart of individuals).

Supporting a process of civic-driven societal change

CIDSE agencies work to bring about a process of '**civic-driven societal change**' – that is change in how society is organised, driven by the active action and commitment of citizens (both as individuals, including both women and men, or collectively through small groups or wider institutions). This civic-driven societal change has three underlying contentions:

- } **Change** is needed in **power relations** (between those agencies and individuals that have power and those that don't have power).
- } **Civil society organisations** are **key actors** in the **process of change** – we therefore look at change within these partner organisations we support (in terms of strengthening their capacities) and change achieved through the actions of civil society organisations.
- } An '**alliance of change**' (See Cordaid's example) is needed to bring about this change in power relations (with civil society organisations allying with government, private sector, the Church and other institutions). It also sets the foundations for a partnership to attain jointly the change sought.

Cordaid: Global Communities of Change concept

The design of the Global Communities of Change (GCoC) is the result of an internal reflection where Cordaid recognises that the current aid system, with its overemphasis on deliverable short-term results, undermines/affects its commitment to change and social transformation.

GCoC are about people (citizens, individuals) and organisations (all types) working together in the pursuit of a social change agenda based on a jointly defined theory of change, and that puts the emphasis on emancipation processes rooted in their own contexts. They are demand-driven, issue-based, locally grounded and rooted and connected to the international agenda in order to find comprehensive and long lasting solutions to global issues.

The GCoC concept aims at instilling a civic driven change approach in all of Cordaid's interventions, and at detaching the organisation from the aid industry to regain contact with the original purpose of civil society as a countervailing power and social engineer/actor of change.

⁹ From *Populorum Progressio*: there are power structures and production systems that generate inequalities and therefore « sin ».

As an external agent and out of solidarity, Cordaid aims at connecting to and supporting those emancipation processes both morally and financially, through joint lobby and advocacy actions, linking agendas and making sure that the voices of the groups at the heart of these emancipation processes are heard at international decision-making levels.

Source: Cordaid, "Global Communities of Change: From Control to Engagement". May 2009

2. How we influence change

CIDSE agencies strive for an integral transformation that implies the emergence and supporting of autonomous social actors and innovative development alternatives. In line with this empowering approach to integral transformation, CIDSE agencies, together with their Southern partner organisations, seek to influence change at different levels:

Programme cooperation: through funding of project activities, capacity building of partner agencies, and sometimes by providing technical inputs. The activities of our partners in Southern countries can be loosely categorised as:

- } providing services and resources to their selected 'target groups';
- } undertaking advocacy to influence policies and institutional practices of governments and institutions, in ways which benefit the target group;
- } influencing attitudes and beliefs – of the target group and of policy makers and decision shapers.

Advocating for change: CIDSE's thinking and approaches are grounded in the concerns and challenges faced by its partners. An alliance for change through partnership aims, by virtue of a mutual dialogue and learning from each other, at producing and achieving sustainable social change. Our work involves advocating with policy makers and decision shapers in Northern governments and international institutions to influence policies and institutional practices in ways that benefit women and men living in poverty. This is often done directly with the policy makers and decision shapers but may also be undertaken through or with our partners (Northern and Southern).

Mobilising and motivating the public in favour of change: Practically, it means mobilising people in our home countries to take action to influence policy makers and decision shapers in support of policies and practices that benefit our partners and their target groups; better informing people through development education about the situation and challenges of our partners and their target groups, and promoting and encouraging greater engagement and ownership of the constituencies we engage with.

By its threefold approach (working with and through partners in the Southern countries, advocating in an alliance of change and mobilising the public), CIDSE MOs intend to contribute to an integral change process that is guided by the Christian motivation of an overall process of "integral conversion". This Christian motivation is particularly highlighted during Lenten Campaigns in the South and in the North.

Partnership: legitimising our actions towards change

CIDSE MOs have established and maintained long-standing and equitable relationships with their Southern partners through cooperation that is built around common values and goals rooted in the principles of Catholic Social Teaching and that strengthens each other's position. Through mutual listening and learning, and through shared analysis and joint advocacy, CIDSE MOs and their partners share the responsibility and the recognition for the impact that can be achieved together in view of a meaningful change designed to renew the foundations of societies, both in the North and in the South.

CCFD: territorial approach and partnerships

Territories are an essential link for an alternative society that would rest on a sound and negotiated cooperation between territorial levels embedded at the international scale. This is the level where the intersection between the macro (structures) and micro (individuals that set the structures in motion through mechanisms and concrete actions) levels can take place. Territories are understood as a geographical space where a set of actors – gathered around a common societal project – build together sustainable relationships (social, cultural, economic and political levels) necessary for the social reproduction and the well-being of people. These territories can be an administrative region, a coherent geographical or/and sociological area (e.g. Amazon Basin, the Senegal River Valley), or a group of territories geographically scattered that face similar problems (e.g. indigenous peoples issues).

Territories should be taken into account in our partnership approach. We need to articulate, at this scale, a strategic thinking that concerns the social, economic and political structures, and a practice that involves the mechanisms which bring the structure into play, making it effective and reinforcing it.

A partnership that takes into account the territorial approach must articulate territories in the North and the South. In fighting together these structural mechanisms that lead to poverty and injustice in the South, we also gain a better understanding of our own social fabric and how it contributes to the injustices both in the South and in our own countries. Moreover, we will draw from this transforming action in specific territories in the North a renewed legitimacy in order to engage partnerships in the South. Consequently, we will become fully involved alongside our partners in the strategic planning and evaluation of actions undertaken.

Source: CCFD- Terre Solidaire, «Réflexions sur les notions de territoire et d'impact» - Séminaire DPI des 29 et 30 septembre 2011

3. CIDSE's approach to impact assessment

Our broad view of development cooperation, and the values that guide our interventions, provide the general framework by which we measure the impact of our development cooperation. Upholding the Preferential Option for the Poor and marginalised requires impact assessment to start with the viewpoint of the poor and the communities who are the most disadvantaged and vulnerable. At the same time, it is crucial to establish a dialogue that encourages poor communities to find out and understand the deep mechanisms within their respective societies that contribute to maintain injustice and inequalities. In doing so, it is important to acknowledge that results and/or changes may happen on the sides of those strictly planned by a given project or programme.

CIDSE agencies look at development as a complex process of societal change that is shaped by many actors – including the women and men living in poverty who are directly affected by this process. Societal change happens within complex systems made up of different components (actors, events at local, national, regional or international level, diachronic and synchronic processes that shape the structures and mechanisms that set in motion inequalities) that are interrelated and influence each other. Therefore we do not expect to find a linear relationship between development interventions (or inputs) and the change actually experienced (outcome-effects-impact). It is neither clear from the outset whether a development project will lead to the expected results, effects and impact as foreseen in the planning process. This makes the process of assessing the impact of our work complex.

The short-term *results-based management approach* demanded by funding organisations does not always address the complexity of development, nor the impact generated by our interventions. The trend is to support projects with easily measurable results that may not necessarily involve complex transformative processes and sustainable changes. This donor-driven approach encourages impact assessment methodologies that will produce indicators of success which only look at the linear/cause-effect, easier to control and with which organisations can claim attribution and show accountability to donors who in turn need to reassure their domestic constituencies, and demonstrate that they have effectively contributed to “change”. The qualitative dimensions of a given programme are often not assessed and the changes that take place during the life of a project are not taken into account. The risk is to reduce

“development work” to simple interventions, in order to facilitate its measurement. From CIDSE’s perspective, change should be understood in terms of an integral transformation process related to deep structural mechanisms within societies, and not only as material changes at the project level.

We are committed to developing impact assessment tools – and support our partners to develop their own together with the people they work with, that address the deep mechanisms that generate poverty and inequalities, that help us to monitor and understand these complex changes as well as tools that monitor and measure more material changes. We believe that a broad focus and range of tools are required to help deepen our understanding and guide our pursuit of complex, transformational social change.

Measuring change: diversity of approaches, common goal

Given that CIDSE agencies and their partner organisations represent different cultures, languages and socio-political contexts, their respective terminology and methodological approaches to impact assessment differ, both within CIDSE agencies and also within their respective partner organisations (see examples).

CIDSE agencies look at impact assessment as a tool for measuring change with three main purposes:

- } **Learning – for both partners and ourselves** - for an appropriate steering of projects geared towards improvement of the living conditions of the poor and promotion of social and sustainable transformation.
- } **Accountability** to our partners and constituencies, and to the public and governments that fund our projects
- } **Strengthening empowerment and ownership** of our partner organisations and of the people they work with as they are involved in the definition of their own impact indicators and are able to voice their concerns and views regarding the development they seek.

Complexity in impact assessment is compounded by the fact that we seek to bring about change through a range of different interventions (including capacity building and funding support to partners, advocacy work with governments and institutions, campaigning and mobilisation activities), at different levels (household, local, national, international), with and through a range of different actors (partners, governments, civil society organisations) and in different social, economic and political realities. As the main purpose of our work is to be transformative, we look for those impacts that address the multiple factors and affect the mechanisms that are at the basis of poverty and inequalities (See examples from Trócaire, CCFD in Annex 1).

We also need to consider the intended and non-intended effects of our interventions, and measure how resistant the changes to which we are contributing are to those changes that we don’t want to see happening. In addition, we need to distinguish impact at both the CSO level and at target group level, where changes would rather appear in behaviour, mindset and attitudes, as well as distinguish material and non-material change. Moreover, in order to be meaningful for women, men, communities and societies, changes must take into account societies’ specific dynamics and realities (link between social changes and social structures), as well as the ‘resilience capacity’ of partners to resist non-desired changes (See example from Misereor and CCFD in Annex 2).

4. Conclusions

Any transformative processes and sustainable changes within societies will only happen if there is a shift in both our understanding and practice of impact assessment, as well as in our theory of change. We should move away from technocratic approaches and management concepts that seek immediate deliverable results without providing answers to the structural causes of poverty and inequality, and without seeking sustainable transformational processes within societies.

As faith-based agencies, CIDSE Member Organisations are committed to a model of human development that is based on the dignity of each individual person, as well as a commitment to achieving the common good at the local, national and global levels. Our perception and measurement of the effectiveness of our work will reflect the principles we share and a genuine recognition of peoples' claims for social justice and sustainability.

We strive to develop and adopt methodologies of impact observation and measurement that:

- look at impact, understood as the lasting changes in the lives of the underprivileged that contribute to social transformation and not only at narrowly defined short-term effects;
- start from the perspective of the poor, including the reflection of positive and negative side-effects;
- try to capture changes (at different levels) that are not easily measurable but are of importance for the poor and for a process of sustainable social transformation;
- empower people to observe and reflect on changes and on the factors that have contributed to those changes; use these reflections to guide their actions;
- contribute to an accountability process that takes into account the complexity of development processes;
- encourage and promote loops of learning.

We are far from having complete answers to these challenges. Nevertheless, we know that, like many other organisations that share a similar holistic understanding of development – in particular our partner organisations in the South – we need the scope and the flexibility to work for impact along these lines rather than following the increasingly elaborate approaches to “prove” the value for money of our interventions in a narrow quantifiable sense.

We are encouraged by the efforts of many other actors who think and work along the same lines. We hope that this paper will contribute to open up spaces to bring about change and to measure it in a meaningful way.

Annex 1

Trócaire : Governance and Human Rights (GHR) global indicators and baseline tools

Driven by concerns to be continuously reflecting on the impact of what we are doing so as to be a reflective and learning organisation and responding to the pressures of demonstrating impact to our various public and private supporters. The over-arching principles of the proposed monitoring framework are driven by Trócaire's belief in the empowerment of individuals and communities through whom participatory baseline assessments can be done which generate reliable and valid statistics for what many have thought were purely qualitative dimensions of development.

Theory of Change

The tools have been designed specifically to support the GHR programme, focusing on the main elements of its theory of change. Before articulating the theory of change it is necessary to look at what we believe will represent impact or success in our work. After some reflection, the current operating version of the GHR's **vision of success** (or impact) is *marginalised women and men will be able to claim their rights from duty bearers, that duty bearers will respond and that they will implement pro-poor and socially just laws, policies and practices.*

Based on this, the key elements of the GHR programme's theory of change are:

- Marginalised and vulnerable people (especially women) will: understand their rights better, both individually and collectively
- Marginalised people will come together as groups or community-based organisations (CBOs) and take action to claim their rights
- Partners will empower and facilitate groups / CBOs to claim their rights
- Partners will provide services, including legal representation, to marginalised people
- Partners will also lobby duty-bearers to implement pro-poor laws, policies and practices
- Trócaire field staff will support partners to achieve the above and will work to strengthen their collective impact through supporting networking, capacity building and collective advocacy as appropriate
- Trócaire field and HQ staff will work with partners to carry out advocacy at an international level to promote, protect and defend the rights of the most marginalised.

Equipped with these elements, the theory of change has served as an effective touch-stone to keep the discourse on baseline measurement on track and ensure focus on what needs and what does not need to be measured. The experience in India has been that over the course of reflection on the tools, and by engaging in what seemed, at times, an endless questioning of both the meaning of 'impact' and of the appropriate elements to be measured in the baselines, the theory of change has continuously been a reference point to keep us on track.

The theory of change has helped focus our assessment efforts on measuring the performance of each of the stakeholders mentioned above – in terms of how effectively they are performing the roles assigned to them in the theory of change. If they are not, then we may need to review either their performance or the theory of change. This should drive learning and improvement.

GHR global monitoring framework

The indicators and framework tools are designed to balance a number of different factors. Firstly, they balance field level monitoring and improvements in practice with global monitoring and reporting. They aim to be practical and recognise that there are limits on the time and capacity people involved have for monitoring. They balance reports of changes in people's levels of empowerment with intermediate indicators that monitor performance of partners and CBOs compared to the key elements in the theory of change.

The tools also provide a way of tackling some of the core problems of monitoring development work across different countries. Fieldwork tends to be specific to each context, so whilst the indicators should be universally applicable, they should also be contextualised on the ground, whilst still generating data that can be compared across countries. Changes tend to take many years to emerge, often involving various different causal factors

beyond a single NGO or partner. By supporting partners, Trócaire itself may be quite distant from poor people. The indicators look at the contribution that Trócaire and its partners are making to other people's efforts, rather than assuming a direct causal line straight through to long-term impact. The monitoring processes are also designed to be relevant for partner field staff, helping them to deepen their insights into the issues people face and to build stronger relationships with them, as well as generating data for higher level reporting.

Global Indicators

The global GHR monitoring framework is proposing that the following five indicators be utilised across all country programmes and form the basis of what the GHR global programme will report on.

Indicator	Means of verification
1. Changes in the % of marginalised groups with specific levels of A wareness, A ccess and A ctions concerning their rights, disaggregated by gender	Feedback from marginalised citizens/groups, using the 'Triple A - Citizen Empowerment Framework'
2. Changes in partner capacity on Governance and Human Rights (quantified and benchmarked)	Self-assessment in dialogue with Trócaire staff, using the 'Partner Capacity Tool'.
3. Changes in the % of CBOs achieving specific levels of performance	Feedback from marginalised groups, using the 'CBO Capacity Framework'
4. Illustrative changes in people's lives	Case studies
5. Value added by Trócaire to partners (quantified and benchmarked)	Feedback from partners, using the 'Keystone Partner Survey'.

Source: Trócaire, Governance and Human Rights programme - Global Indicators and Baseline Tools: Current workings and learning to date from India baseline process, 2010

CCFD-Terre Solidaire - Example of the double strike strategy

In order to build societal alternatives, CCFD places the focus on impacts that will affect those mechanisms within societies that generate poverty and inequalities. Not only does the action aim at eradicating what is visible (the symptoms) but also at neutralising the root causes and the mechanisms that generate a given societal problem. Impacts therefore primarily target the functioning of societies rather than their shapes. CCFD-Terre Solidaire seeks impacts that are deeply transformational. As a starting point, Impacts are conceived as hypothesis to be verified and enriched. Targeted impacts derive from the analysis of specific contexts. In terms of impacts, partners and the partnership relationship are expected to last and to evolve.

The double strike strategy consists in achieving both a technical and a political excellence. Impacts are sought at the same time as and in the implementation of conventional development programmes. However, the difference with conventional programmes is that activities find their goal and their ultimate *raison d'être* outside of their initial aim. They therefore have a double purpose: (1) they serve those (objectives and recipients) for which they have been designed (first purpose or direct purpose); and (2) they will also serve to trigger or support impacts (second purpose or indirect purpose).

Example: a microcredit programme is designed to help small farmers to buy cheap inputs and avoid money lenders (first purpose). At this first level, the aim is to achieve **technical excellence** where an efficient microcredit system puts at the service of farmers the funds necessary to develop their activities. Meanwhile this same programme is explicitly designed and implemented to introduce a new microeconomic concept and practice (second purpose or indirect purpose of the same programme through the same actions). This second level aims at achieving **political excellence** as the same credit system will contribute to transform the social relationships, rationality and network operations. In other words, a deeper social transformation of the mechanisms that used to organise the local economic relationships takes place.

Source: "Position paper on change and impact for CCFD-Terre Solidaire, Conclusions from the Impact working group" - With the support of Philippe De Leener, Intermonde, April 2011

Annex 2

MISEREOR – Focus on changes perceived as important by the communities – participatory data collection through trend analysis

External evaluations commissioned by MISEREOR attempt to take account of the complexity of development processes. Evaluators are expected not only to verify whether intended effects are achieved by a project, but also to explore unexpected changes that may have been caused by the project's work.

A useful instrument to analyse changes in MISEREOR evaluations is **trend analysis**. It is one of a range of instruments used during evaluations; the results of trend analysis are triangulated with the results of other instruments (e.g. semi-structured and structured interviews, analysis of project documents, direct observations) in order to verify the observations and provide a sound basis for realistic conclusions and recommendations.

During trend analysis communities or groups analyse, in gender-specific sub-groups, the positive and negative changes of different aspects of their situation, as well as the unexpected changes which become visible. If possible comparisons between communities or groups (which have not as yet participated in any project activities) are identified for the realisation of trend analyses in order to provide additional information about trends without project influence. This comparison facilitates the attribution of changes to the project.

The situation of the families which participated in project activities is analysed before project measures started, during and after their implementation. The target groups give scores (e.g. ranging from 0 to 5 points) for a number of fields of observation. These fields of observation (up to max. 10 fields of observation) are selected by the evaluators considering the areas in which the project is active and outcomes or impacts can be expected, such as food security, health conditions and organisational structures, whilst also considering areas in which negative changes are possible, such as the situation of women, conflicts, soil fertility, etc. The selection of the fields of observation is discussed and verified with project staff and usually also with the target group or its representatives.

During trend analysis the target groups discuss the scoring of each field of observation, considering the different aspects related to these fields. Only when agreement between different participants is reached is a score given. For example, for food security the target groups analyse the development of harvest, food aid, availability and prices of food on the market during recent years, as well as the changes that can be observed. The second step of the trend analysis is to attribute these changes to the factors causing the change, such as the project, other organisations, the political situation and the climate. This discussion process normally provides substantial information about the changes in both the living conditions of the target group, as well as the causes responsible for these changes which allow, in turn, the attribution of changes to project activities, showing which changes can be identified as outcome or impact of the project activities. During trend analysis the information received by the evaluators during discussions is at least as important as the scoring attributed to each year and each field of observation.

The tool allows the target group to discuss their view of changes, to analyse the factors which have contributed to these changes, to learn about their situation and to share this learning process with the accompanying organisation. This learning process empowers the target group and enhances its understanding of the changes which have been experienced. Different experiences and stories are brought up, people reflect on their history, the difference between men and women and the factors which were important during the analysed phase. After the assessment, in each meeting the results of women's and men's groups are compared, and existing deviations in the scoring are discussed with the members of the two groups.

To a certain degree, this instrument replaces baseline surveys (which are often non-existent) by analysing the situation before the initiation of the project and after project intervention, based on the subjective memory of the participating persons. It does not only look at the project objectives, but rather at the situation of target groups in a holistic, disaggregated way, moving from a donor-driven to a people-driven perspective of life.

Contributed by: Barbara Jilg, Independent Evaluator for Misereor

CCFD-Terre Solidaire – Monitoring impacts in societies: the example of the Dogon women in Mali

At the end of the 90s in Mali, women grew onions and shallots in an isolated and arid area of the Dogon region. In spite of their efforts and the substantial support provided by their husbands, income was insufficient to cover education and health care costs for their children. Confronted with this situation, women decided that instead of trying to increase their current production, they would look more closely at what they already have and analyse how it is managed.

Their analysis of their own household budget showed that more than 30% was dedicated to expenses such as jewellery, perfume and loincloths – items intended to give to portray the illusion of their own prosperity and wealth towards the other women of the community. It appears therefore that the construction of an identity absorbs part of the budget that should be allocated to health and education. Thus, they decided together to take action in their village, as well as in the neighbouring ones. Awareness raising of their daughters was also another action taken in order to not perpetuate the model.

This example sheds light on several points:

1. The recognition that the mechanism lies at the heart of a given society: external appearance is crucial in the identity construction and sense of well being of women
2. The finding that this identity mechanisms and its consequences on the household budget allows the definition of an impact, and at the same time starts a break up in society
3. In reducing conspicuous expenses but also *de facto* in affecting identity dynamics, women can free resources for health care and education of their children.
4. Their analysis led them to realize their (and therefore also men's) subordination to money and to wealth signs, highlighting the tension between *use value* and *exchange value* which actually goes through and seriously affects the entire village economy and by extension the world economy.

From this example it is possible to set up an instrument for monitoring impacts and at the same time introducing the rationale to build up this type of instrument: (1) follow the process of taking control of the impact by the people involved in the project; (2) look at the development of impact itself. In both cases the different levels of complexity or depth of the impact development process and the impact itself will be seen. In addition, for both levels the social spreading process of impact for both levels can be screened.

Over time, it will be possible to highlight the complexity of the impact and its social spreading. More importantly, the instrument will allow an understanding of (1) why and how progress is made or not, and (2) along the way, whether another mechanism may be at work behind the first one, e.g. the result of the tension between the value of use and the value of exchange, as outlined at the beginning of the analysis.

This example is useful because it specifically shows what it means to CCFD-Terre Solidaire to support partners by seeking, in collaboration with them, mechanisms that are rooted in the heart of society. It is also useful because it demonstrates that this work can be done with people with no specific university background.

Source: "Position paper on change and impact for CCFD-Terre Solidaire, Conclusions from the Impact working group" - With the support of Philippe De Leener, Intermonde, April 2011



CIDSE Members



Austria



Belgium



Belgium



Canada



England and Wales



France



Germany



Ireland



Italy



Luxembourg



the Netherlands



Portugal



Scotland



Spain



Switzerland



USA

CIDSE is an international alliance of Catholic development agencies. Its members share a common strategy in their efforts to eradicate poverty and establish global justice. CIDSE's advocacy work covers global governance; resources for development; climate justice; food, agriculture & sustainable trade; and business & human rights. www.cidse.org.

Document contact: Cayetana Carrión, [carrion\(at\)cidse.org](mailto:carrion(at)cidse.org), +32 2 233 37 50

July 2012
