Monitoring of effects (movie)

Effects-oriented planning and implementation of projects working to promote peace – a manual

Institut für Auslandsbeziehungen e. V.
zivik – civil conflict resolution

© 2007
Institut für Auslandsbeziehungen e. V. (ifa)
zivik programme – civil conflict resolution
Zimmerstraße 11
10969 Berlin

www.ifa.de

Author of the original German text: Dirk Sprenger

Produced with the financial support of the German Federal Foreign Office.
Contents

FOREWORD

1. Introduction: why focus on effects?
   1.1. Why are effects important for projects working to promote peace?
   1.2. What is the purpose of a manual on effects?
   1.3. How is the manual structured?

2. Background: why develop movie as a tool?
   2.1. Why produce (another) manual on effects?
   2.2. Who are the intended users of the manual?
   2.3. What terms are used in defining effects?
   2.4. What are the observations, assumptions and considerations which
        underpin the methods section?

3. Methods section: how does movie function?
   3.1. Situation analysis: understanding the situation, determining the need for
        change, identifying starting points for change processes
   3.2. Planning: identifying desired effects, planning change processes
   3.3. Monitoring and evaluation (M&E): incorporating observation and
        reflection in project activities
   3.4. Evaluation workshop: sharing and evaluating observations, assessing the
        consequences, reflecting on amendments

AFTERWORD
FOREWORD

The manual you are reading deals with the question of how to determine and compare the effects of projects working to promote peace.

The central issue addressed over the following pages is the monitoring of effects, a process known in German as Monitoring von Wirkungen, the letters of which led us to name our tool “movie”. In the same way as the development of a detailed script assists in the production of a film, movie aims to facilitate the laying of a solid planning foundation with which to implement projects working to promote peace.

In 2002 we established our framework concept for the evaluation of projects working towards the peaceful transformation of conflict which served as a baseline in examining the methods for transparent and standardised evaluation of divergent projects. Our primary motivation in adopting that framework was the evaluation of completed projects.

Since then in supporting various projects we have gained significant experience concerning project planning and implementation. We have come to realise the critical importance of giving consideration to the effects of a project’s activities at its conception stage and in its later implementation. In this way, subsequent evaluation of the project results is easier for all concerned. With the development of movie we aim to encourage conscious changes in project management practice capable of leading to modifications in attitude and behaviour at the stage of project delivery.

The issue of how the effects of projects can be included from the outset in project development was central to a process of policy design which included a workshop with project holders and applicants in autumn 2006 and an expert meeting in spring 2007. The present manual results from those discussions.

We should like to thank the parties involved for their enthusiastic assistance and hope that the manual will be successful in reaching a broad set of users. The manual should not be regarded as a short cut to the faultless planning and implementation of projects working to promote peace but as a user-friendly tool with adequate scope for individual customisation.

The approach to the measurement of effects contained in this manual results from the work of Dirk Sprenger. He saw through the manual’s development; compiling, collating and recording on numerous occasions the various experiences, expectations and interests expressed. We are particularly grateful to him for those efforts.

Peter Mares
Dialogues Department
Head of zivik programme
1. Introduction

Why focus on effects?

1.1. Why are effects important for projects working to promote peace?

Effects are the consequences of events or actions. They can be positive or negative, intended or unintended. NGOs which implement civil conflict resolution projects are working towards changes in society. They wish to bring about a situation in which violence is replaced by other forms of conflict resolution.

Events/ actions → effects

In the societal context in which these organisations operate it is generally possible to have an overview only of a narrow section of the complex realities surrounding the project. However, peace processes involve numerous actors in a village, town, region or entire country. In addition, international actors and their interests play an important role, too. Change processes may operate over a period of months, years and sometimes generations. Only as a result of continued monitoring and experience is it possible to classify changes as intended or unintended effects, categorising them as positive or negative.

To avoid the situation in which a connection cannot be made between the work of a project and its subsequent effects or the work of a project leads to violence in a conflict setting, the following question needs to be considered: “Are we doing the right thing and are we doing it in a way which produces the effects we are aiming for, with a resulting improvement in the current situation?”

1.2. What is the purpose of a manual on effects?

Our aim in producing this manual is to support applicant organisations in the planning of their project and submission of their application and to discover common answers to the question mentioned in the previous paragraph. movie, the tool, derives its name from the German phrase for the monitoring of effects. However, movie includes more than the simple task of monitoring, that is to say, observing the consequences of actions. It relates to the process of analysis, planning, action, observation and of subsequent adaptations in behaviour employed with a view to achieving the desired change.

In this sense, movie should be understood as tool for the planning and implementation of projects working to promote peace. movie does not lay down an implementation plan but contains the potential for customisation in accordance with individual needs.
1.3. How is the manual structured?

In the second chapter, “Background: why develop movie as a tool?”, we consider the reasons for producing the manual and introduce its target group and chosen form. In that context, we focus on setting out the assumptions and considerations which underlie movie.

In the third chapter, “Methods section: how does movie function?”, we explain the chosen approach, breaking it down in four working steps.

1) **Situation analysis**: what is the starting point for the project? What has to change? Where is potential for change?

2) **Planning**: this involves fetching our image of the future into the present and reflecting on what route is needed to get from the present to our desired future.

3) **Monitoring and evaluation (M&E)**: taking steps to observe what happens and to analyse its meaning – how can this process be anchored in the project sequence?

4) **Evaluation workshop**: how can M&E instruments be used in a workshop context?

It is important to recognise that movie does not focus on evaluation by external experts but on the implementation of evaluation processes by organisations themselves and on the ongoing adaptation of their project activities as a reaction to the situation.

Since methods can be explained more clearly in the context of specific examples, Annex I uses a case study to illustrate movie. The case study describes a working process by which movie can be adapted to the needs of an individual project.

Annex II contains two charts. The first shows the implementation of movie in the form of a table and the second in a standard logframe.
2. Background

*Why develop movie as a tool?*

2.1. Why produce (another) manual on effects?

The zivik programme of the *Institut für Auslandsbeziehungen* (ifa) advises NGOs and the German Federal Foreign Office on matters of civil conflict resolution and funds, documents and evaluates projects which operate in conflict regions throughout the world. The funding programme is financed through resources made available by the German Federal Foreign Office.

- zivik stands for civil conflict resolution and builds the link between the German Federal Foreign Office and project holders.
- zivik supports the operation of projects working to promote peace through the identification of good practice, advice, workshops and the production of publications such as this manual.

In the period 2001 to 2007 the zivik team was responsible for around 400 projects. A repeated observation was the inadequate visibility of a connection between the actions implemented by the project holders and the effects they sought to achieve (societal changes). The zivik team attributes these findings to a lack of resources on the question of effects. This prompted the idea of the present manual.

On examining the existing literature the zivik team concluded that the methods available are portrayed in a manner which is not always user-friendly and frequently very complex and academic, ignoring in practice the realities of organisations.

In recent years the issue of effects has been discussed and pursued at international and project level in the field of development cooperation. Both levels are relevant to the holders of projects funded by zivik.

Effects have a role to play in the whole framework of international cooperation. The *Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness* (2005) is a good example of this concern. The core question is how to structure and implement international development such that its intended effects are the same as its actual effects. In addition to planning, monitoring and evaluation, matters which are at the heart of *movie*, the issues which are central here are the cooperation between donors and partners, questions of partner country ownership and collaboration between donors.

- More information on the background to *movie* can be found in the article ‘Potenziale und Grenzen. Evaluierung von Aktivitäten der Friedensförderung’ by Martina Fischer contained in the ifa publication: *Frieden und Zivilgesellschaft. Fünf Jahre Förderprogramm Zivile Konfliktbearbeitung* (Wochenschau Verlag, 2006).
Effects are the subject of discussion also at project level in the context of how to structure projects sensitive to conflict. In this regard, the manner and form in which measures are implemented is of fundamental importance. Every action in a particular context results not only in desired but also always in unforeseen effects. These can lead to further unexpected positive changes in the situation. However, circumstances characterised by a particular dynamic repeatedly occur in which project measures maintain the existence of the conflict situation or provoke even additional conflict to develop. Studies on peace and conflict impact assessment (PCIA) and the *do no harm* principle illustrate this point convincingly. No matter how paradox it may sound, it is quite feasible for a project working to promote peace to produce effects which intensify the conflict. The core question is how to structure and implement projects in conflict situations which as far as possible avoid unwanted effects intensifying the conflict and strengthen the effects of conflict transformation and peace promotion.

*movie* builds on existing approaches drawing, in particular, on actual project experience. In this context, the methodology of *outcome mapping* ought to be mentioned.

2.2. **Who are the intended users of the manual?**

The manual was compiled primarily for the staff of organisations which cooperate with zivik in the context of project funding but is intended also for all those individuals who are interested in the planning and implementation of civil society projects working to promote peace. The focus is on the detailed structure of (project) implementation. The handbook is aimed more towards small to medium-sized organisations and less towards the major actors of international cooperation since as a rule these have adopted their own guidelines on project work.

2.3. **What terms are used in defining effects?**

*Goals and effects*

Previously, the planning and implementation of projects was primarily defined in terms of “goals”. In order to achieve stated aims, planning, observation and monitoring were effected with those goals in mind. Today, the term “effects” is the central focus of project planning and implementation. Planning and operations should be **effects-oriented** as should be monitoring structures, too. Simply to exchange one term for another, replacing “goals” with “effects” in project management speak does not result necessarily, however, in changes at project management level.
The formulation of goals is often equated with the depiction of a particular state: "At village level, five mediators will be trained and in conflict situations they will assume their role as independent arbitrators." The underlying thinking presupposes the existence of linear, causal connections (if ABC happens, then XYZ will result). The assumption is that on achieving a particular state, the desired change will also result: "If the mediators are trained and do their job well, then there will be a reduction in violent conflict at village level." The focus of observation and monitoring during the project’s operational phase is on achieving the desired state. However, as the experience of complex situations repeatedly shows, connections are not as simple as the planning stage assumes. Achievement of a particular state does not result necessarily in the desired societal changes. A frequent observation then is that although many actions are implemented – maybe even very well trained mediators are available to act – the desired changes occur only in a fragmentary manner or fail entirely to result.

This deficit may be seen as an impetus for change at a project management level. The planning stage focuses no longer on the identification of particular conditions, but on changes. The primary aim of monitoring is no longer to ensure staff suitably implement the planned measures (training of mediators) but on bringing about the desired changes (reduction in the use of violence). The focus on effects means that in identifying project goals greater emphasis is placed on their definition. This implies a qualitative change in the formulation of goals. In our example the reformulated goal might require the trained mediators to re-examine and follow up at predetermined intervals conflict situations in which they previously mediated. Their aim is to record and document qualitative changes in the behaviour of the parties to the conflict.

Levels at which effects occur
Goal-oriented project planning is concerned with various levels: results, project goals and overall objectives. If the results are present and certain predetermined assumptions satisfied, the project goal has been reached. On reaching the project goal and satisfaction of certain further assumptions it should become apparent that the overall objectives – at least in part – have been achieved. On the introduction of the “effects” concept most organisations concerned with project management have retained these levels. However, the terminology used to describe them has changed. Output has replaced result, outcome replaced project goal and impact replaced overall objective.

The methodology of movie is primarily concerned with the levels of outcome and impact. outcome represents effects occurring within the project sphere, in particular, alterations in the behaviour of certain key actors (change agents) who contribute significantly to the change process. impact represents changes occurring on a large scale, for example, visible contributions to peace in a particular region.
### zivik manual: project monitoring

#### Goal-oriented planning / with focus on effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result / deliverables</th>
<th>Project goal / direct benefit</th>
<th>Overall objective / indirect benefit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>change agents</td>
<td>project goal / impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impact</td>
<td>outcome</td>
<td>overall objective / indirect benefit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Effects-oriented planning in accordance with *movie*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change agents</th>
<th>Key actors who contribute to the change process</th>
<th>Indicators allowing an assessment of progress to be made</th>
<th>Large-scale changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In formulating their objectives, particularly at the impact level, many projects insert the small but significant phrase: “To make a contribution towards ...”. This places the matter in a realistic light as one project alone does not bring peace to a region but can make only a contribution in that direction. For that reason account needs to be taken of the projects which other actors are delivering. Only when many coordinated projects take place does the chance increase of change occurring at the impact level.

### 2.4. What are the observations, assumptions and considerations which underpin the methods section?

**The interdependence of the levels at which effects occur**

Donors wish to donate their money as effectively as possible. The more comprehensive and presentable the effects of a funded measure are, the more appropriate the use of the funds. Therefore donors frequently want to identify effects in the sense of *impact*, that is to say, visible contributions towards peace. However, project holders create effects in the framework of their project scope, in the sense of *outcomes*. Changes in the broad framework occur generally (if at all) only following expiry of the funding period. The diversity of areas in which influence may be exerted at *impact* level often results in an authorship gap. Whilst a convincing connection between the project measures funded and the changes in the broad framework perhaps may be proposed, it cannot be established, however, in causal terms. Peace processes require time and rely on the collaborative effects of many participants and factors.

---

1 This statement adopts zivik’s approach to project funding which is based on the calendar year and allows for a maximum twelve-month funding period. In making this statement no account has been taken of the possibilities for follow-up funding.

2 See the study: *The systemic approach to conflict transformation* (2006) published by the Berghof Foundation for Peace Support, Berlin: “...very often expectations of the activities’ effectiveness were simply too high. The difficulty in measuring effectiveness is a problem in two respects: in many instances, it is hard to demonstrate the impact of these activities and thus to provide adequate justification for them. However, this does not appear to deter third parties from nurturing excessively high expectations: indeed, at first, these are generally supported by donors and implementing partners before being swiftly abandoned when difficulties arise. No effort is made to question the objectives and strategy and adapt expectations accordingly.” (p. 9)
Networked not linear thinking: a systemic perspective

In recent years in the field of international cooperation a model has become established in the framework of the discussion on effects with which causative relationships concerning effects – linking the activities of a project with changes in the broad framework – may be demonstrated. Those relationships are known as chains of effects. Regrettably, the image of a chain of effects leads to misunderstandings. It conjures up a strong sense of linearity: a series of dominoes arranged in a chain, each falling one after another as a result of an initial impulse. With the exception of the first domino, all other dominoes fall on being hit by their predecessor. In this situation a direct cause and effect relationship applies.

The project reality in the field of conflict resolution and the implementation of peace processes looks rather different. Many conflicts are characterised by a high degree of complexity to which justice can be done only with a systemic perspective on the analysis. Static cause and effect relationships are excluded from this perspective. Instead, it presumes a complex interaction between cause and effect, in other words, the operation of a dynamic change process. The consequences for movie are that the attainment or non-attainment of each goal identified at the planning stage has implications for the situation analysis on which the project is based.

In the case of long-term projects or those with similar content synergies can arise. However, the environment is often competitive and the actors on the ground may hinder each other’s activities. In addition, sudden outbreaks of violence may destroy processes of reconciliation between conflicting parties which have developed over many years. For projects to contribute successfully to change, a focus on unrealistic linear chains of effect needs to be replaced by one which concentrates on essential key actors and connections – components which are not to be regarded, however, in static terms.

Thinking in terms of change, not in states of affairs; making change processes comprehensible

Whilst international cooperation projects concentrate primarily on structural change and on addressing deficiencies, a core focus of conflict resolution and peace support projects is on effecting changes at a human level, for example, through the provision of additional resources allowing conflicts to be resolved without violence. The effects which can be achieved by projects working to promote peace can be identified at outcome level in the form of behavioural changes. At impact level these changes may contribute in certain circumstances to structural changes in society. Behavioural change may include situations in which:

- individuals become involved in the peaceful resolution of conflict in their local surroundings;
- individuals resume and attempt to strengthen relationships which formerly existed;
- individuals in a particular context decide to reject the use of violence and resort to other means because they have changed their attitude.

---

**Change needs process indicators**

If an organisation wants to be sure of doing the right thing to bring about the changes it wishes to achieve, criteria need to be identified. These have to be criteria which can be used to determine that changes are taking effect. However, behavioural changes in the context of conflict situations are precisely the sort of modification which do not occur overnight but in the framework of extended processes and are subject frequently to setbacks. For that reason, the development of process indicators (not to be confused with result or goal indicators) is of particular importance. These are milestones set along the way, signposts which confirm that the process is moving in the right direction.

**What the situation requires**

The planning of every project should be preceded by a situation or conflict analysis. The aim of that analysis should be to capture the situation and to mark the starting points from which the project can develop its own contribution towards conflict resolution or peace support. In addition, even allowing for the complexity of the situation, the analysis should identify fundamental structures and key actors for bringing about change. For the issue of effects the situation analysis is particularly important. Only on performing that analysis is it possible to identify what changes are necessary and what steps can be taken towards achieving those changes.

Peace and conflict situations are often unstable. Peace processes can be lamed if one party or even simply a splinter group decides to break away. As a result, situation analysis cannot be a one-off task prior to planning the project but is an integral component of the monitoring process during the entire project delivery phase. The changes which a project intends to set in motion occur always in a particular context and not somewhere removed from that situation.
3. Methods section

How does movie function?

The following chapter deals with the approach taken by movie and can be divided into four working stages:

1. Situation analysis
2. Planning
3. Monitoring and evaluation (M&E)
4. Evaluation workshop

The first step to be taken is situation analysis. This is an exercise designed to allow for a record and understanding of the project’s scope to be made. In the light of that exercise possible starting points for change processes can be identified. The next stage relates to the planning of a project working to promote peace, i.e. how to describe the effects which the project aims to achieve and how to plan and set in motion change processes. The third and fourth stages involve an explanation of the principles of monitoring and evaluation and their application in the framework of an evaluation workshop. The emphasis is on the implementation of processes within organisations (how to observe, reflect, act in a considered manner, recognise consequences, think through changes and ultimately adapt project activities to the situation).

In performing those exercises reference points are provided by the organisation itself, key actors and the project context.

For ease of understanding and organisation each of the working stages set out in this chapter is structured identically and is built around the following core questions:

What are the important features?
How might this stage be approached?
What are the possibilities for assistance?
What are the frequently asked questions?
3.1.  Stage 1 – situation analysis:
Understanding the situation, determining the need for change, identifying starting points for change processes

What are the important features?
A situation analysis with a particular emphasis on peace and conflict issues aims to identify opportunities for change processes. It is not intended to be a comprehensive record of a complex situation. Rather, its task is to cut through the complexity, identifying the fundamental key actors and connections through which change can be effected and capable of contributing to the resolution of a conflict. Situations change all the time. That is why a situation analysis is not a one-off task, but an ongoing process.

How might this stage be approached?
A team composed of internal staff and external contributors allows for differing views and perspectives to be incorporated in the analysis. A starting point to begin is by asking: What features of the situation are currently unknown or cannot be assessed because of its complexity?
The number of questions involved can be reduced by focusing on the fundamental key actors and connections.

Helpful questions may include:
- What role does the organisation itself play in the conflict situation?
  What are other actors doing in the field? What are they planning to do?
Consideration should be given to the organisation’s own role both as an actor and as a situation component. Relationships with other organisations are important, too, as are the possibilities to strengthen and complement each other’s work through the pursuit of joint activities.

- Who are the central actors in this situation?
  Individuals who continue to employ violence,
  Individuals who benefit from the current situation,
  Individuals who suffer from the current situation and are disadvantaged,
  Individuals who want to change things and are capable of doing so.
If solutions are to succeed, they need to incorporate local individuals on the ground. Identification of the key actors is a step in that direction.

- What are the fundamental issues at stake in the current situation?
  Is it possible to identify causes and their consequences?
The purpose of the question is to avoid a situation in which an organisation’s intervention is ineffective, simply scratching at the surface of problem, and to ensure the identification of issues central to the dynamics of the conflict.

- What is happening in the situation? What are the features of the situation dynamics?
These questions relate to a further fundamental aspect – the connections between the actors, issues and various relationships identified in the analysis process. A characteristic feature of conflict dynamics is that they often lead to a hardening of the situation.
- **Whose activities or which features need to be strengthened or supported?**
The focus is on the actions of parties in the conflict situation and on the question of what behaviours or dynamics ought to be strengthened to support the change process as a whole.

- **Whose activities or which features need to be reduced, limited or halted?**
It is not enough to work only with individuals who want peace. Conflict resolution requires also an understanding of what behaviour is capable of altering or shattering a particular set of dynamics.

**Obtaining information**
Once the questions which are key to the project have been identified (the list here is only a suggestion), information needs to be obtained from differing sources and sufficient time set aside for the team to evaluate the material.

**The core of the analysis**
Conflict analysis instruments, such as, for example, actor mapping may provide assistance in visualising and structuring the situation analysis. However, the real work in developing the analysis takes place in team discussions.

**Repeating the steps**
If essential information needed for understanding the situation is missing, it may be necessary to repeat certain process steps. The situation analysis process is designed to allow for the repeated identification of new questions.

**Starting points**
Possible starting points for developing change processes should be identified.


**What are the possibilities for assistance?**
Questions and doubts arising in the course of the process should be seen as part of the reflection needed to produce a situation analysis. Contacts and exchanges with organisations or experts on the ground may prove to be useful leading to joint efforts in producing the situation analysis as a result. The zivik website has links to country and conflict analyses.

**What are the frequently asked questions?**

*Who will fund a situation analysis?*
Only a few funding providers are willing to provide additional funds for the production of a situation analysis. This is true, even though an initial analysis is necessary before a project can be planned and a funding application made. To get around that issue requests can be made to zivik and other funding providers to obtain funding for a feasibility study. The production of a detailed situation analysis can be included as one of the first project activities identified in the application.
How frequently are situation analyses produced?
A situation analysis is produced at the outset of a project and is needed at a later stage when assessing effects. What was the situation at the start of the project and how has this changed? What is the significance of these changes for the activities of the project?
This underlines the importance of revising the situation analysis on a periodic basis. Regular revision can take place in the framework of monitoring and evaluation measures (see stages 3 and 4). A more comprehensive situation analysis is needed also before starting to plan a completely new project phase and where there are serious changes in the project environment.

3.2. Stage 2 – planning:
Identifying desired effects, planning change processes

What are the important features?
Planning means fetching our image of the future into the present and reflecting on the route needed to get from the present to our desired future. Planning means also: thinking first in terms of connections and changes and only afterwards in terms of activities.
The plans and the situation analysis provide the basis for project activities and for the accompanying monitoring and evaluation (M&E) measures. Updating and revision of the plans will take place at various stages of M&E. In certain cases, detailed plans can be developed only after the first project activities have begun to happen (for example, because of staff changes or highly limited resources in the planning phase). In those cases, the provisional situation analysis and plans should be subject to a further revision at the beginning of the project phase.

How might this stage be approached?
Developing a vision of the future
“Five years from now how are people going to live and work together?”
The vision of the future should not be some abstract imagined objective, but as concrete a description of that state as possible. This allows a direction to be identified for the change process. In the framework of the project only certain aspects can be addressed and so it is important to identify the project’s location. This helps determine what wheels the project itself can set in motion and where the overlaps with the activities of other projects are to be found.

Giving some thought to the key actors and their role in the change process
Change processes can be initiated only in cooperation with and through the activities of key actors. These are the individuals or groups identified in the framework of the situation analysis as players who are relevant to the change process.
If peace processes are to have a chance of success, their solutions need to be based on the insights of the parties involved.
Setting milestones for the change process
What is needed of the key actors for the desired changes to take effect? The route from the starting point, what the key actors are doing now, to the place identified in the vision of the future involves the accomplishment of several stages. Not all stages on that route are linear. Setting milestones can be a very useful exercise to be sure that things are happening and that activities are heading in the right direction. They signpost the route needed to reach the vision of the future previously identified.

How can an assessment be reached on whether and how the key actors make progress in the change process? The early milestones (at least) can be set in the planning phase at the same time as identifying the first activities. What small changes are intended to result and what can be done to support the key actors in achieving changes in their behaviour?

Producing the organisation’s self-assessment
If a change process is to be productive the organisation involved needs to engage in self-reflection during that process, adopt a position with regard to the conflict context and retain the possibility for self-transformation.

Planning activities
Only when the actions of the key actors have a constructive influence on the conflict situation has the goal of change been reached. So the question needs to be asked: what measures are capable of producing a positive influence on the conflict behaviour of the key actors?

Reflecting on the features of the context (assumptions and risks)
What features of the context could operate to hinder, prevent or encourage the change process? The connections which exist between context features and the desired change process are particularly relevant for M&E activities.

Giving some thought to unwanted effects
No change process exists in which no unwanted effects arise. Unwanted (negative) effects cannot be avoided. However, a way of dealing with them needs to be found. Initially, only assumptions can be made as to the unwanted effects which might arise. As the project progresses, however, it is important to observe whether those unwanted effects materialise.

What are the possibilities for assistance?
Hiring an external moderator with knowledge of relevant methods may be helpful when holding a planning workshop. The possibility of involving key actors in this process might also be considered.
What are the frequently asked questions?
How can the planning process introduced here be incorporated in a logical framework (logframe)?
The image which is recorded in the vision of the future corresponds to the impact level of a logframe. The role of each key actor in the change process corresponds to an outcome. The logframe results level corresponds to the attainment or non-attainment of the predetermined milestones. Where the project involves cooperation with several donors the method proposed here can be transferred to a logframe (see Annex II).

Where are the indicators?
In conventional planning exercises goals are defined almost always in highly abstract terms. As a result, these are supplemented by indicators, i.e. specific markers which can be used to verify whether goals have been achieved in the project framework.
By way of contrast, the indicators which are relevant to project success are process indicators (in the language of movie: milestones with a signpost function). Milestones are fundamentally important to thinking in process terms. A project which is well planned is likely to be a project which is well implemented.
Milestones can be used to assess what changes and resulting impact has already occurred. The project plans can then be adapted. In this way precisely defined objectives and milestones substitute for conventional indicators.
The planning elements of *movie* can be set out in a diagrammatic overview as follows:

**Impact:** A specific vision of the future. Against the background of the current situation what changes should occur?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key actors:</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who are the individuals or groups with whom the project intends to work primarily for the purposes of facilitating the desired changes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What do the key actors do to bring about the desired changes and what is their role in the change process?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones (process indicators):</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What markers can be used to check that the key actors are moving forward step by step in the change process and to identify the progress made?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-assessment:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How does the organisation intend to reflect on its own conduct and to respond to those findings in the course of the project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action plan:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Who</em> is doing <em>what with whom</em> and <em>when</em> and <em>how</em> is that being done so that step by step progress can be made towards the changed patterns of behaviour identified at the <em>outcome</em> level?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assumptions and risks (context → project):</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What features of the context could operate to hinder, prevent or encourage the intended change process?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible unintended effects (project → context):</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What effects might arise as a result of the project which are more likely to worsen the conflict than encourage peace?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3. Stage 3 – monitoring and evaluation (M&E):
Incorporating observation and reflection in project activities

**What are the important features?**

Monitoring is the observation of existing connections between an organisation’s own actions, the key actors with whom the project is working and the overall context. Evaluation is the assessment of observations. What consequences can be drawn from the observation, or in other words, what amendments will be made to the project?

In the framework of *movie*, evaluation does not mean that an external expert assesses the project and issues recommendations. Rather, M&E in the framework of *movie* stands for taking action on the basis of (self-)reflection:

“Are we doing the right thing and are we doing that in a way which produces the effects we are aiming for with a resulting improvement in the current situation?”

**How might this stage be approached?**

*Including monitoring & evaluation (M&E) in the planned activities*

On starting to plan the first project activities the M&E process should be included as an activity in its own right. An appropriate balance needs to be achieved between working with the key actors and reflecting on that work, remembering that the focus lies on the change process and that in this context M&E is only a means to an end.

*Designing a suitable M&E process*

- As implementing organisation:
  - What can be observed in relation to:
    - the capacity to function as a project team,
    - the self-image adopted,
    - the planned activities,
    - the connections between the activities pursued and the key actors?

- The key actors:
  - Which of the key actors reaches or even exceeds one or more of the milestones set in the planning phase? Which milestones are these? Which key actor goes off in a different direction and why? What observations lead to that conclusion? What was the cause of those changes?

- The context:
  - Bearing in mind the situation analysis: what changes can be observed in the project surroundings? What developments or changes in the context factors can be observed which could influence the success of the change process? What unwanted effects resulting from the project’s own activities can be observed? What led to those changes?
Allowing time for M&E
Every three months a one-day workshop and after six months a two-day workshop should be held. In addition, it is a good idea to have regular team meetings at weekly or two-weekly intervals. At the end of a training session it is desirable to allow an hour for feedback/reflection on the training process (with the participants/trainers). If possible, after six months this reflection exercise may be repeated. There are advantages in holding discussions and taking notes on a regular basis and in recording observations made at team meetings.

What are the possibilities for assistance?
Ideas and suggestions generated by other organisations relating to the use of M&E methods can be helpful. The work of the M&E coordinator can be supported usefully through the services of an external coach.

- For further information see the comprehensive manual on effects-oriented M&E produced by the organisation Search for Common Ground, *Designing For Results: Integrating Monitoring and Evaluation in Conflict Transformation Programs*, which can be found at: http://www.sfcg.org/
- A worthwhile and highly pragmatic approach to effects-oriented M&E with a focus on emergency aid can be found in: *The Good Enough Guide – Impact Measurement and Accountability in Emergency*, published by a consortium of NGOs and available for download at: http://www.oxfam.org.uk/
- An alternative, pragmatic method of monitoring is the “Most Significant Change” (MSC) technique, also known as “Monitoring without Indicators”. A guide to this approach produced by various NGOs can be found at: http://www.mande.co.uk/docs/MSCGuide.htm

3.4. Stage 4 – evaluation workshop:
Sharing and evaluating observations, assessing the consequences, reflecting on amendments

What are the important features?
Snapshot observations taken as part of the daily routine of project activities do not provide a real overview of how a project is progressing and whether plans are leading in the right direction. Above all, they do not really allow for connections to be identified, a matter which is at the heart of M&E in the context of change processes. Only when the team gets together in a workshop framework can evaluation take place, i.e. observations can be assessed, consequences appraised and possible amendments considered and planned.
How might this stage be approached?

Workshop facilitation

Since all the team members are project participants and need to report on activities, hiring an external moderator may be a sensible measure – especially when considering the investment involved in bringing together the project team and other selected individuals for a two-day workshop. A good moderation allows valuable time to be put to productive use.

Identifying the workshop agenda in cooperation with the moderator

At least for the first workshop the M&E coordinator should take time to identify jointly with the moderator the agenda for the workshop. The agenda should be designed to meet the expectations of the persons involved.

Possible building blocks for a workshop:

- Welcome and introduction to the workshop: expectations, objectives, updating of the agenda
- Reporting of impressions, experiences and observations of the most recent project phase structured according to connections existing between:
  - the organisation itself, responsible for project implementation,
  - the key actors with whom the project works,
  - the context in which the project operates
- Assessing the information gathered, drawing consequences, considering possible amendments, next steps
- Specific planning of the next project phase: what amendments are to be made? What exactly are the next steps?
- Identifying follow up activities, assigning responsibilities to individuals
- Team conclusion (what initial effects could be identified?) and close of the workshop

Creating favourable conditions for the workshop

It is particularly important to choose a location in which all participants can concentrate fully on the workshop. The greater the importance team members attach to the workshop, the more highly motivated their participation will be.

A common experience is that although workshops produce impressive results, little if any of these filter through to implementation. Often the activities of a workshop itself are called into question (efforts involved too great, benefits too marginal). However, workshop results do not implement themselves, action must be taken to implement them. To allow for implementation of the results (follow up), time needs to be set aside for this purpose immediately following the workshop.

How is the workshop integrated in the overall process?

No process exists without evaluation workshops. If no account is taken of changes in the project environment, project activities cannot be implemented. That is true at least, if a close connection is meant to exist between project activities and the changes which the project aims to achieve. The evaluation workshop allows for a review: consideration of the position reached and reflection on how the future is to be approached and planned.
What are the possibilities for assistance?
One particular aspect of assistance – often underrated – is the external moderation of such workshops. An external moderator comes with a different perspective and allows all participants the chance to engage fully in the reflective process and frees them from having to perform several roles at once.

What are the frequently asked questions?
Is an external evaluation necessary?
A process-oriented approach coupled with evaluation workshops cannot and is not intended to replace external evaluation. A separate decision on external evaluation needs to be taken in accordance with the circumstances.

Who can provide the feedback that the project is doing the right thing?
The individuals from whom the project would like to receive feedback need to be incorporated in the process. Obtaining feedback on activities performed, recording what has been achieved and gaining recognition for individual efforts are fundamentally important as motivating factors. And the fact cannot be ignored: a high degree of motivation is a basic requirement for effective change processes.

AFTERWORD

Theory needs to be followed up with practice. Methods can be better explained with specific examples.

Annex I demonstrates movie’s operation by way of a case study. It offers a clear illustration of the working process by which movie can be adapted to the needs of individual project.

Annex II contains two overviews. The first, using the case study of Annex I, illustrates the implementation of movie in the form of a table and the second demonstrates how movie can be combined with a standard logframe method.