Outcome Mapping

LEARNING COMMUNITY

Newsletter 2009 No. 2

In this Issue...

- OM ideas paper series
- Gendered Outcome Mapping
- Piloting Outcome
 Mapping with Young
 People
- PSO features
 Outcome Mapping in the Netherlands
- Meet the Stewards
- Community News and latest resources



Welcome!

Welcome to the fourth biannual newsletter of the Outcome Mapping Learning Community. As the facilitator of this very vibrant community I am very pleased to be able present to you a round-up of what has been happening among our members.

This issue presents the experiences of three organisations as they reflect on the applicability of Outcome Mapping in their contexts. Sana Shams presents the work of the PAN Localisation project in developing a customised version of the Outcome Mapping toolkit specifically for situations that need to explicitly incorporate gender sensitivity. Jessica Greenhalf discusses how Plan UK is using and adapting OM to engage young people in the design of their governance programme.

The Outcome Mapping Learning Community

is a global group of over 1800 individuals dedicated to collective learning and sharing of knowledge around Outcome Mapping. It was formed in 2005 and has been steadily growing since then. It is supported by the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) and managed by the Overseas Development Institute in London.

www.outcomemapping.ca

Finally, Cristien Temmink from PSO, an association of Dutch development organisations, describes how many of their members are unsatisfied with the predominantly linear models that are used to monitor and evaluate capacity development and how OM is gaining increasing interest among these Dutch organisation.

We also highlight many of the new resources that are now available in the community library. These include:

- Making Outcome Mapping Work Volume 2; a synthesis of another year of community discussions;
- The first three papers in a new series called OM ideas that aims to highlight key developments, innovations and experiences in the theory and practice of Outcome Mapping;
- Seven new case studies of OM use involving many of our community members;
- A paper from ODI aimed at guiding donors and managers of development programmes in effective use of OM;
- Entrants and winners of the recent outstanding resources competition.

We hope you enjoy this issue. Please let us know if you have any recommendations for the next issue. Simon Hearn, Community Facilitator.

OM ideas paper series



(ale)ess	Considerations for learning-oriented Monitoring and Evaluation	
(8/5/5/5)		
31/200	with Outcome	Mapping
Hub Huyse	Outcome Mapping (OM) was developed both as a planning and a monitoring basi, And	Dox 1: About Utilization-Forumed Evaluation (UFE)
	while it has been used successfully for both purposes, this brief focuses	UFE makes conscious use of both findings and the MSE process. Proc-
Kala Anthrose CARE Canada	on CM as a monitoring and evaluation (MSE) approach in particular, many users identified a need for deaver	escort -Enteres shared understanding -Support and nembers interes-
DAYS Careas	guidelines on how to make CM MSE race functional and constructive. This	Sons -increase engagement, self-date-
	brief, based on various events, papers, workshops' and conversations on the	minutes, sweeting
	Outcome Mapping Learning Commu- nity (DALC), attempts to respond to this need.	-Contribute to programme and or- ganisational development
	According to the results of a web- survey of CM practitioners in August	proposes a utilisation-bouned as
	2006, there are three interrelated in- sees that surface frequently and that sees that surface frequently and that	proach to MSE (see Box 1). Choosing what to monitor and evaluate can be a dounting test, especial).
	require further discussion, distribution and gradition a) Collection and aggregation of data. How to modify taker the OM.	when project and programme teams become attached to their planning systems and feel the need to more
	journals to support data collection and storage.	for everything. In the web survey, re- sponderts indicated that CM helped to a large extent of this or somewhat
	 b) Interpretation and sense-mak- ing: The process of reacting to and interpreting the data. 	(33%) in defining users and uses of an MSE framework. The respondents re-
	of Usage: What will happen with the data; How it will feed into decisions. While CMI discent provide any hard-	for to the spirit of mutual accountability. that exists because of the participation of boundary partners in the design and
MAN I P DOOR THINK	and-fast rules of how to deal with each	implementation of the MAIT process. However, further startly is needed or
spring through classic or	of these issues, it does recognise that each issue must be part of a good M&E.	however, further startly is needed or how to define users of MSE state and
	system, and some of the key concepts.	how their information needs should
te (Al refloring)	underlying philosophy and the basic tools certainly provide ideas of how we	be met. A utilisation-focused evalua- tion approach asks such questions as
The places in this series are sufficient	can incorporate these issues into our MEE outlens.	Who needs to participate in the MSS process?", What tipe of information is
promptly of (the past declinated in		required and what will happen with 87
AND DESIGNATION OF THE PARTY OF	Making shoises: Prioritising M&C by identifying upors and	and which tools are the most appropri
Print priumi Chi	meet of members of other ton	ate for collecting and analysing MSS data?"
		Participation in MSE is undentoon

Clear Makes Constitution Co

A conceptual fusion of the logical framework approach and outcome mapping

OM ideas Paper No. 1. Daniel Roduner and Kaia Ambrose. June 2009. This paper describes the rational for and the process of creating a fusion model incorporating OM and LFA.

Considerations for learning-oriented Monitoring and Evaluation with Outcome Mapping

OM ideas Paper No. 2. Kaia Ambrose and Huib Huyse. July 2009. This brief focuses on OM as a monitoring and evaluation approach. In particular, many users identified a need for clearer guidelines on how to make OM M&E more functional and constructive and this brief attempts to respond to this need.

Module on Step-0: How to prepare for OM Intentional Design

OM Ideas Paper No. 3. Daniel Roduner and Olivia Hartmann. October 2009. Existing manuals make a lot of implicit assumptions about processes and preparations that have taken place before actually applying the OM approach. This module makes those assumptions explicit.

Gendered Outcome Mapping



By Sana Shams, Center for Research in Urdu Language Processing, NUCES, Lahore, Pakistan

Concerted efforts to "Promote gender equality and empower women" form the basic criterion in nations' development, a criterion upon which global development is also being monitored [1]. With a rising concern to encourage women

participation in ICT4D (Information and Communication Technologies for Development) initiatives, project evaluation methodologies are sought that highlight practitioners' focus on gender issues in project implementation.

The majority of project development methodologies address gender only implicitly. This is because it is believed that women can automatically benefit from the development programs, assuming that both men and women have equal access to opportunities and treatments provided through the program [2]. However, gender analyses of communities reveal that access to ICTs is dependent on power relations in class, race ethnicity and location. This propels complex and hidden inequalities between the two gender groups and affects social the social impact of these interventions [3]. In this context, a gender-related project development (planning, monitoring and evaluation) approach is important in sensitizing project planners to potential gender issues from the earliest stage of their work and at the same time be easy to use within the project timelines.

Gendered Outcome Mapping (OM^g) presents a comprehensive methodology for infusing a gender focus within the project design, coupled with a utilization-focused evaluation perspective. OM^g is unique as it includes gender analysis at the outset of the project development and hence integrates the gender perspective into all phases of the project, including its design, implementation and evaluation. OM^g has been developed by researchers working on the PAN Localization project [4], funded by IDRC, Canada, an ICT4D initiative providing information access in ten Asian countries. The project involves developing localized ICTs, training grass-root communities on the technology and developing locally relevant content based on the indigenous needs. This framework helps create a deeper understanding of the challenges and opportunities that development interventions present to women.

The OM^g framework assists the project planners to articulate how its outcomes, expressed in terms of changes in behavior of the people, especially women, will contribute to large-scale development-related changes by separately identifying its boundary partners on the basis of gender. OM^g, like standard OM, is organized into three stages: Project Planning (comprising of Intentional Design and M&E planning phases), Monitoring and Evaluation.

Project Planning: The project planning phase is further subdivided into intentional design and M&E planning. Through the intentional design, OM^g makes gender explicitly visible in the project's vision and mission statements by documenting aspirations and actions on how to address gender within the target intervention. To stimulate such thinking, the OM project planning worksheets have been modified to explicitly address gender. For example, in the identification of boundary partners a requirement has been added to state which gender group they belong to: male, female, or including both genders.

Similarly, when defining the outcomes for these boundary partners, unique outcome challenges can be developed for each of the three gender groups. If there are differences in the way the program will progress for different gender groups, the program can develop separate (or additional) progress markers for male and female members, even of the same boundary partner.

When developing the strategy map, the OM^g framework pays particular attention to developing specific strategies to address each gender. If an outcome challenge is for both



genders, then in addition to developing generic strategies to involve both gender groups, the team can design additional specific strategies for male and/or female participants.

OM^g also allows the project team to focus on how to incorporate gender concerns into organizational practices. The framework helps a program identify the factors that create gender biases in an organization and to work towards adoption of measures to eliminate them. OM^g has modified the organizational practices to support this. For example, by suggesting the collection of feedback about the program from female informants as well as male and by advising to sensitize higher management to gender issues.

Monitoring Phase: The OM^g framework follows the principles of gender segregated data collection based on the outcome journals, strategy journals and performance journals. OM^g helps the program design these data collection instruments, but their usefulness will depend on the commitment of the team to collect data regularly and reflect on their work honestly.

These journals are used to record gender-specific periodic changes to the program specifically focusing on the project progress in terms of the achievement of the Outcome Challenge, the Strategies employed or the effectiveness of the Organizational Practices in place.

Evaluation Phase: A gender sensitive evaluation must use the experiences of women as the foundation of evaluation planning and analysis. Evaluation must consider whether the project has made a difference in the lives of women and must be viewed as an empowerment tool for all participants including women. Composition and expertise of the project team is seen through a gender lens which is truly possible if the team members involved in monitoring and evaluations have necessary gender analysis skills.

To facilitate documentation of planning, monitoring and evaluation findings, the PAN Localization project has developed an online tool for OM^g framework (www.genderedom.net). The data is centrally located and conveniently accessible to the partner teams across Asia for synthesizing results both nationally and regionally.

The tool enables the users to share the experiences and project documents with other project members, and OM^g users. Authentication and authorization is embedded into the tool, to ensure the security and leverage level of users.

The implementation of the OM^g framework in the PAN Localization project has shown its great strength in achieving project goals with the assessment of gender issues.

For more information please contact Sana Shams: sana.gul@nu.edu.pk

[1] Millennium Development Goals, www.un.org/millenniumgoals

References:

- [2] Guidelines for the Integration of Gender Issues into the Design, Monitoring and Evaluation of ILO Programmes and Projects, Eval/Prog, Evaluation Unit, ILO, Geneva, Jan. 1995.
- [3] Gender and ICTs, An Overview Report, 2004, Anita Gurmuthy, http://www.bridge.ids.ac.uk/reports/CEP-ICTs-OR.pdf
- [4] PAN Localization project, www.panl10.net, accessed on 30th Jan. 2009.

Piloting Outcome Mapping with Young People



By Jessica Greenhalf, Plan International UK

This article highlights how Plan UK is working to integrate elements of OM into its Governance Programme. The programme aims to improve the wellbeing of children and youth by supporting them to engage with and demand accountability from the government and other

duty bearers, particularly in relation to the delivery of basic services. It supports a range of projects in Africa, Asia and Latin America and aims to actively engage young people in its operations; including project planning, monitoring and evaluation. We believe that young people should inform, in their own words, the decisions on what constitutes the programme's success and failure.



Using OM in Plan UK's Governance Programme

We decided to introduce OM to our programme because the approach focuses on the types of changes that any governance initiative is most concerned with; changes in the behaviour, attitudes and practices of civil society and state actors and in the relationships between these different actors. In addition, we were hopeful that some OM tools (e.g. visioning exercises and graduated progress markers) could be easily adapted for use with young people.

To date we have used OM for the following purposes:

- Project planning with young people in Malawi we reviewed a youth livelihoods project which had been designed with limited participation from young people. Working together to refine the project outline generated greater understanding between the young people and other project stakeholders present at the workshop.
- Reflecting on project strategies with staff in Indonesia we explored the change process required to foster communitybased child protection systems. Debating the 'depth' of different changes brought out sharp differences across the four target districts and highlighted the need for context specific strategies.
- Developing a monitoring framework with Plan UK's Youth Advisory Panel (YAP) — as part of their annual planning process, YAP members reflected on their roles and responsibilities and discussed how they could hold each other accountable. YAP members will review the progress markers they developed at each quarterly residential.

What have we learned?

Combining OM with existing frameworks has been challenging. However, its relative flexibility as an approach to PME has enabled us to adapt the different tools for use with young people. Furthermore, OM has created space to explore some of the complex changes underpinning deceptively tidy project logframes. In doing so, it has increased understanding, solidarity and ownership amongst project stakeholders.

OM focuses on the types of changes that any governance initiative is most concerned with; changes in the behaviour, attitudes and practices of civil society and state actors.

Our experiences using OM with young people so far suggest that:

- Youth are instinctive visionaries! While adult participants may be reluctant to try a new approach, young people are often quick to grasp ideas and contribute their aspirations.
- Introducing OM to a group of mixed ages, perspectives, skills and experiences takes time. You need to be creative and use concrete examples to explain key concepts where possible.
- The ages of the young people involved need to be taken into consideration; a 16 year old is likely to engage in discussions differently to a 21 year old. Gender sensitivity is also important, for example young women speaking in workshops may not be common.
- All activities need to be tailored to young people to ensure they
 can participate fully. This includes simplified versions of any
 reference materials and attention to the use of OM/general
 project management terminology which can exclude young
 people.
- In addition to the lead facilitators, as many participants as possible should have a thorough understanding of OM so they can guide small group discussions. Ideally the facilitating team should include young people as they can help to engage their peers.
- Sensitivity to the range of different interests/agendas in the room is critical. Don't expect consensus on all points and ensure that the views of young people are heard and considered.

What's next for the programme?

We will continue to support the use of OM in Malawi, Indonesia and the UK and hope to use pending mid-term project reviews as an opportunity to integrate elements of OM in other projects where there is interest. We will refine the draft toolkit over the coming months based on these experiences and hope to generate some accompanying 'youth-friendly' workshop resources. We are also continuing to explore how OM can add value to the programme's overarching monitoring and evaluation framework

For more information contact Jessica Greenhalf: Jessica. Greenhalf@plan-international.org



Young people present their M&E strategy

PSO features Outcome Mapping in the Netherlands



By Cristien Temmink, PSO

Background

PSO is an association of fifty Dutch development organisations that focuses on capacity strengthening in civil society. Herein, special attention is given to the quality of cooperation between Dutch PSO

members and their Southern partners. Within the association, generating knowledge on capacity development and learning from practice with members and their partners are considered key.

In 2008, during a PSO event 'Learning from innovation', members expressed their interest in qualitative methods for monitoring and evaluation. They experienced that when it comes to following processes of capacity development, linear methods have limitations. They are often result based, but do not give insights into how those results are achieved. Often, cause — effect relations are based on assumptions and do not illustrate reality. Moreover, interesting and relevant process information gets lost since unintended results are not captured or are neglected.

As PSO adheres to the idea that capacity development is ultimately an endogenous process, the vision of those directly involved or affected becomes extremely relevant. The aim of a good PM&E system should therefore be to see which changes eventually take place and what these mean for the different stakeholders; in this process changes in the relational sphere become very important. To facilitate reflection around PM&E of social change processes, PSO organised in 2009 various activities around qualitative monitoring and evaluation methods, including Outcome Mapping.

Why Outcome Mapping?

PSO members had questions regarding which method might suit them best, and many had heard about Outcome Mapping. They considered Outcome Mapping appealing because of the expected potential to deal with the questions mentioned above. However, very few organisations had experience applying it. The questions raised regarding Outcome Mapping were how to use it, what Outcome Mapping implies in terms of relationships with donors and partners, and how Outcome Mapping can be combined with

"It makes sense 'to grow'
Outcome Mapping instead of
'installing it' since it is only a
method, with all its limitations,
and the sense making takes place
between the people who use it."

more quantitative methods such as Log frames. PSO's interest as an association lies in how qualitative PM&E methods such as Outcome Mapping can provide insights into capacity development at

different levels (from individual to organisational and institutional) and from different perspectives, as well as facilitate both learning and accountability purposes. After an introductory event, PSO organised a deepening session on Outcome Mapping, the so-called 'Pit Stop'.

The 'Pit stop'

The Pit stop on Outcome Mapping was the first of its kind. Its purpose was to offer organisations a chance to learn more about the method, re-fuel on their existing knowledge, or do maintenance where needed. Moreover, participants were invited to investigate possibilities for experimenting with Outcome Mapping within their own organisations.

For the Pit stop PSO invited Christ Vansteenkiste from the Flemish NGO "Vredeseilanden" (VE) to share the story of how and why VE adopted Outcome Mapping. Christ presented an inspiring case of how Outcome Mapping can contribute to learning within an

organisation and between an organisation and its partners. Moreover, it showed that Outcome Mapping is a flexible method that can, and should, be adapted to one's own unique situation.



Petrol station in Pakistan

Participants of the Pit stop were inspired by the VE presentation. One participant asked if Outcome Mapping can be phased in or whether there is a way of "growing it", rather than "installing it". Christ explained that VE chose not to ask their partners to plan in terms of Outcome Mapping. It has been applied to the relationship between VE and their partners but the partners were not expected to apply it to the relationship between them and their boundary partners. Thus the conclusion was that it makes sense to "grow" Outcome Mapping since it is only a method, with all its limitations, and the sense making takes place between the people who use it.

Some participants expressed their intention to start applying Outcome Mapping, but merely as a pilot. Others realized that application is more complex than they initially expected. In particular getting buy-in from management and reserving significant resources, both human and financial, were considered challenging.

PSO has also been inspired to move on with exploring qualitative PM&E methods. A 'Thematic Learning Programme' around Outcome Mapping has been launched by PSO and several members. Its purpose is twofold: to stimulate and facilitate learning among member organisations and their partners around this topic, and to generate knowledge that is relevant for the development sector as a whole. These two are strongly interrelated since PSO starts from the premise that information and experiences by itself are not knowledge; they require reflection on application, and questioning what you actually can do with it. Therefore, PSO will follow the processes of application and facilitate follow-up meetings to share experiences, support and learn from each other, and generate and document lessons learnt.

It is motivating to see that partner organisations are very interested to be part of the learning program. A good example is the PSO member organisation STRO, that is being pushed by its partners in El Salvador to experiment with Outcome Mapping in their program. These partner organisations, in turn, got inspired themselves by a Mid-term evaluation that was conducted using parts of the Outcome Mapping methodology. We are looking forward to assess how Outcome Mapping influences the relationship between STRO and their partners, and contributes to learning about processes of social change.

For more information please contact Cristien at Temmink@pso.nl

Meet the Stewards

The community stewards are the core group of members who voluntarily run the OMLC in collaboration with the secretariat. They are involved in planning community activities, advising and supporting members and providing strategic direction for the community. In previous issues of this newsletter we heard from Daniel, Kaia, Heidi and Julius, now we meet the remaining three members of the group.

First up is Ricardo Wilson-Grau



Who are you? An independent organisational development consultant and evaluator, working primarily with international social change networks and private development agencies.

What is your experience with OM: I came to OM through evaluation when I discovered the concept of outcomes and began to use it in evaluating networks and donor programmes. Thus it is in evaluating and monitoring outcomes, rather than in the intentional design, that I have the most experience and indeed interest.

If you could take one aspect of OM what would it be? The concept of outcomes as changes in social actors who are the protagonists of impact

If you could give one piece of advice to someone just starting out with OM...: Understand the key principles – boundary partners, outcome, outcome challenge and progress marker – and then adapt them to the needs of the organization.

What's the most interesting application of OM you've come across? Evaluating the outcomes of artists participating in the Dutch funding agency Hivos's art and culture programme in Central America. The theory of change was that by supporting art for art's sake you will contribute to development. Therefore, by design there were no predefined results and all the outcomes were unintended! Result: over five years Hivos contributed to changing policies and practices in government, business and civil society that support flourishing film, music, theater, dance, visual art including digital, and literature in the six countries.

Next we have Ziad Moussa



Who are you? I am a Research Associate at the Environment and Sustainable Development Unit of the American University of Beirut. I manage three R&D projects targeting the MENA region on "Evaluation Theory and Practice", "Urban Agriculture" and "Communication for Development"

One interesting fact about yourself: Prior to recycling into academia and consultancy I was a TV and radio host ©. The radio shows were purely musical but the TV show "Tales from the Land" investigated the social transformations in the Arab societies using agriculture and natural resources management as an entry point. It was forced to stopped after a highly contested

episode which criticized the efforts of various Arab governments to force Bedouins to embrace a sedentary mode of living

What is your interest in / experience with Outcome Mapping? OM was my entry point to whole wide world of evaluation. Most of my work experience in OM is focused on "Arabization" (an consensual Arabic terminology has been developed and the translation of the OM book is currently in press) in addition to training and coaching on OM applications in MENA

If you could give one piece of advice to someone just starting out with OM...: OM is first and foremost about people and cannot be done "behind closed doors". The mastery of OM is necessary but not sufficient to implement it successfully, it must be coupled with open mindedness, good facilitation skills and ability to address and resolve conflicts

What's the most interesting application of OM you've come across? The "Arabization" was a big challenge, far more complex than a mere linguistic exercise. We partnered with 30+ researchers, development practitioners and academicians from 8 countries to build consensus around a common terminology, and had to come-up with completely new terms to describe key OM steps. In Arabic for example, "Boundary" and "Peripheral" are used interchangeably which totally defeats the paradigm behind "Boundary Partners". We had hence to call them "Essential Partners" while stressing on the direct interaction and mutual influence dimensions

And finally, Jan Van Ongevalle



Who are you? Until the end of October this year I was working as M&E advisor for the Flemish Office of Development Cooperation and Technical Assistance (VVOB) in Zimbabwe. From the first of November I started as the research leader for development cooperation in the Higher Institute of Labour and Society at the University of Leuven in Belgium. In this position I will be able to continue working with Outcome Mapping and learning centered M&E systems.

One interesting fact about yourself: After my initial university studies and before entering the field of development cooperation and M&E, I worked for three years trading sports horses. Even today I am still using some of the lessons that I

learned during that period, e.g. working hard and easily interacting and networking with people with very different backgrounds and interests.

What is your interest in / experience with Outcome Mapping? I have practical experience with implementing outcome mapping in various VVOB programmes in Zimbabwe (e.g. the St²eep project 2005 -2008 and the Quality Education and Vulnerability Programme 2008-2013). Besides providing training in OM I also assist other organizations with the implementation of OM. I find OM to be a very user friendly and highly participatory and learning based project cycle management system that is particularly suited for complex projects that work towards capacity development and whole systems change.

If you could take just one aspect of OM what would it be? The sphere of influence. This concept is very helpful to clarify the position and role of the project implementing team and the boundary partners whom the project seeks to influence. This provides a good basis for developing a realistic monitoring system that focuses on outcomes as changes in behaviour or practice at the level of the boundary partners.

What's the most interesting application of OM you've come across? I am very impressed by the way Steff Deprez and his team in VECO introduced OM across their programmes. They used a very interesting step by step action learning approach to plan, implement and review their OM based monitoring system.

Resources Awards 2009

Earlier this year we called for resources to be submitted for the Outstanding Resources Competition. An opportunity to share articles, presentations, case studies and reports with the chance to win a cash price for the most interesting and relevant resources. We had five very good entries, all highlighted below. The winners were **Steff Deprez** with his paper on creating the right environment for applying OM (which you may remember as an article in the previous newsletter), **Sana Shams** with a write up of the Gendered OM approach and **Phoebe Farag Mikhail, Aissata Ndiaye and Jessica Greenhalf** from Plan UK with a workshop report summarising their lessons applying OM with young people. All of these resources are available in the community library.

Winners:

Creating the (organisational) conditions for an OM-based M&E and learning practice by Steff Deprez

The paper presents a possible approach for programmes to analyse and plan for the necessary organisational conditions to implement an OM-based M&E and learning practice.



Gendered Outcome Mapping Framework by Sana Shams

Gendered Outcome Mapping
(OMg) presents a
comprehensive methodology
for infusing a gender focus
within the project design,
coupled with a utilization
focused evaluation perspective
to project evaluation



Piloting Outcome Mapping with Youth in Malawi by Phoebe Farag Mikhail, Aissata Ndiaye and Jessica Greenhalf

Plan UK used Outcome Mapping in Malawi as a method to engage youth in the design of the monitoring and evaluation of their governance programme. The process was useful to both the youth and the programme staff. At the same time, we learned a lot from the process about using OM in different contexts with different audiences.



Other entrants:

How to Guide for using Outcome Mapping with Youth - Plan International

A brief description of how Plan UK used elements of Outcome Mapping for our governance M&E framework and a how to guide for engaging youth in the M&E of our governance programme, based on our experiences piloting this process in Malawi and in the UK.



Outcome Mapping in child rights based programming

The presentation shows how outcome mapping is applied in child right-based programming. This is a sharing of the actual experience of Plan Philippines in country strategic and area long term planning conducted from October 2008 to June 2009.



New Case Studies in the community library

VECO Indonesia



The focus of VECO's programme is to improve the livelihoods of organised family farmers through sustainable agriculture chain development with important thematic considerations of participation, institutional development, and gender.

Case study key features:

- A distinctive feature of this case is that OM is applied across the organisation as the operational framework for learning and accountability.
- OM is integrated with the log frame approach.
- VECO Indonesia apply OM in the context of value chain development.

St2eep Zimbabwe



The Secondary Teacher Training Environmental Education Programme (St2eep) in Zimbabwe aims to integrate environmental education (EE) into the curriculum of secondary teacher training and to support EE initiatives in the colleges and pilot schools in order to enhance the sustainable utilisation of natural resources, and promote life skills.

Case study key features:

- OM in this case was particularly effective at bringing partners into the monitoring and evaluation process shifting the ownership of the programme to the local actors.
- An innovative framework was developed that integrates two perspectives at once, allowing both the programme team and the support team to make sense and use of the OM framework.



SAHA

SAHA is a rural development programme in Madagascar. The programme is designed to assist groups of land workers and communes in three major regions of Madagascar (Imerina, Betsileo and Menabe).

Case study key features:

- OM is primarily used to plan the programmes' interventions with intermediary groups
- The donor in this case was interested and enthusiastic about the approach and encouraged exploration of OM

RAPID Strategy 2005/06



The Research and Policy in Development (RAPID) Programme is situated within the Overseas Development Institute (ODI) and works to understand and improve the contribution of research-based evidence to better policy and practice in the international development and humanitarian spheres, through a research, advisory services and public debate.

Case study key features:

This case study looks at the use of Outcome Mapping to help form the strategy of RAPID and provides lessons that will be particularly useful if you are interested in:

- Introducing and implementing OM in stages over a period of time, or partially applying it
- Using OM as a practical planning tool
- Building an OM framework from your team's experiences and reflection on their everyday work
- Strengthening the strategy map and progress marker elements

ILRI



The International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI) is a non-profit-making and non-governmental organisation working at the crossroads of livestock and poverty, bringing high-quality science and capacity-building to bear on poverty reduction and sustainable development for poor livestock keepers and their communities.

Case study key features:

- This case study is about a research institute recognising the need to measure the success of their research outputs in terms of outcomes rather than impact.
- Outcome Mapping is applied retrospectively to 5 research projects in order to learn more about the process of achieving development outcomes through research outputs.

Ceja Andina



The Ceja Andina project was a three year project focusing on the sustainable use of agriculture and forest biodiversity in the northern Ecuadorian Andes, in a cloud forest region known as the Ceja Andina. It involved research-oriented work), as well as policy development, social learning processes and strengthening local government.

Case study key features:

- Ceja Andina was among the first applications of Outcome Mapping and paved the way for many others.
- OM was used to enable a participatory approach to M&E with responsibilities distributed among the team rather than a designated M&E person.
- OM was seen to be consistent with the action learning approach of the project and the need for adaptation and flexibility.

BaKTI



The Eastern Indonesian Information Exchange (BaKTI) was originally intended as a knowledge bank for donor project information and lessons learned in the region and has evolved into a knowledge sharing service supporting and facilitating agents of change. Its aim is to encourage eastern Indonesian stakeholders to be more knowledge-based and to raise the profile of the region among donors and central government.

Case study key features:

- This study demonstrates the value of a partial application of OM, where the Intentional Design was developed as a guide but not stringently adhered to.
- The major value that BaKTI gained from OM was the behaviour-oriented approach. Although the terminology and process of OM weren't necessarily adopted by the project, the concepts that embody OM have been absorbed quietly and comfortably.
- Institutional rigidity proved to be an obstacle in mainstreaming OM. BaKTI was required to work within the more traditional log frame approach.

Community News

Outcome Mapping events

3-day Outcome Mapping training

Date: Sun 22 - Tue 24 November 2009

Location: Jakarta, Indonesia

Hijau Biru are offering two trainings in Bogor **Summary:**

> Indonesia from November 23-26: PARTICIPATORY PROGRAM DESIGN: Program Logic & Outcome Mapping Training, and MOST SIGNIFICANT

CHANGE (MSC) TECHNIQUE

Contact: nataliemox@gmail.com

4-day Outcome Mapping training

Tue 15 - Fri 18 December 2009 Date:

Location: Arnhem, Netherlands

Summary: This practise oriented 4-days training course

focuses on application of OM tools to developing

ideas as well as existing projects.

Contact: ia@mdf.nl

4-day Outcome Mapping training

Date: Tue 24 - Fri 27 November 2009

Location: London, UK

Summary: ODI is hosting a 4-day workshop to introduce the

> basic principles of Outcome Mapping, with particular emphasis on their application to the planning phase of development projects and

programmes.

Contact: e.cardoso@odi.org.uk

4-day Outcome Mapping training

Date: Mon 22 - Thu 25 February 2010

Location: Yeppoon, QLD, Australia

A four day workshop including a half-day surgery **Summary:**

and peer assist. Trainers: Terry Smutylo and John

Anderson

Contact: jaydeea@bigpond.com.au

New resources in the community library

Making Outcome Mapping Work Volume 2 Innovations in Participatory Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Edited by Simon Hearn

Jan Van Ongevalle

September 2009



Making Outcome Mapping Work Volume 2

This book represents the experiences and knowledge shared by the community members between the period Jan – Dec 2007. It has taken the combined effort of a number of community members to document, summarise and synthesise a large number of discussions

Outcome Mapping: A realistic alternative for planning, monitoring and evaluation

This paper reviews OM principles to guide donors considering support for projects using OM, and other decision-makers seeking methods to improve the effectiveness of aid



Contextualising Outcome Mapping in Bahasa Indonesia

The paper describes the start of the contextualisation process of OM in Indonesian. It is the result of a 3day OM contextualisation workshop organised by VECO Indonesia and ACCESS Phase II.



This newsletter has been published as part of an IDRC supported project managed by the RAPID group at the Overseas Development Institute.

Edited by Eva Cardoso and Simon Hearn, ODI. s.hearn@odi.org.uk www.odi.org.uk/rapid

Contributions gratefully received from Cristien Temmink, Jessica Greenhalf, Sana Shams, Ricardo Wilson-Grau, Ziad Moussa, Jan Van Ongevalle and other members of the Outcome Mapping Learning Community.



