

... it is critical to disentangle the discussion on generic principles from operational principles from operational tools. For me it works like a cascade. The generic principles ('this is how we see the world') lead to operational principles ('so this is what counts') lead to operational ('so this is how to focus, intervene and learn'). The principles (of OM) are, ... generic principles related to a social relationship/complexity understanding of change. These are not unique to OM or any other methodology. These generic principles and values (they're a bit of a mix) are one's paradigm, if you wish. I see the world through the eyes of these principles as well yet only a small part of my work draws on the OM methodology. ... The OM-specific operational principles cross over with generic principles and values in a grey so are actually quite hard to separate out. They are not totally exclusive to OM but are the direct design principles, and include, I think, for example: 1)Because change is complex and a result of multiple actors acting simultaneosuly in a 'system', focus your intended interventions (and learning about results) on those who you can influence directly. 2) As change is non-linear, change is best described in terms of a non-linear progression towards an

3) As change is a result of people and their relationships, behavioural change is the focus for analysis

And then there are the nuts and bolts – the identification of BPs, the progress markers, etc... What is interesting about options such as LFA is that their generic principles/values (eg 'change can be known ahead of time', 'indicators are good, sustainable measures for tracking change', etc..) and operational principles are not made explicit. They zoom in on the tools. Hence the need to return to what underlying assumed values/principles these are based on to know whether that is what is suited for you/a certain context.

problem of measuring and proving impact because what we promise with LFAs is usually not possible to achieve,. ... Unless we find the courage and creativity ... to reveal how misguided LFA-managed "Development Projects" can be, this space will continue to close down and all the valuable initiatives, experiences and learnings that we have gathered (despite LFAs) will be continue to be lost. For me OM is a real alternative that can be a key part of our work to manage our practice and relationships with real and honest learning approach to change.

What we need to effectively help practitioners with these M&E approaches and tools is not to decide which of the existing approaches is better than other. An approach is not only better on itself but on the way it can help achieve the objectives one is targeting. Unless, we have comparative analysis on the OM and LFA practices, I find it very speculative the theoretical judgments made here and there. Even though LFA have been advocated of imposed by donors, I am sure what about the OM, the debate should be oriented on how best can the funds recipients use these approaches. On the ground, this situation is not encouraging. And the question that always comes in my mind is whether we really want to learn from project implementation? If we do, then a proper application of either LFA or OM or the combination of both is needed. Finally, can we think about linking LFA to OM so that the M&E information generated from the OM will complement those from LFA? Finally, I personally like working with both approaches and this help me improve the learning process about development effectiveness.

## Julius Nvangaga

an appropriate combination of approaches (OM, LFA and others) that best serves objectives is ideal. However, each stakeholder will have both explicit and indistinct objectives, dearly held. We should not lose sight of the value or strength each approach offers, even if that includes keeping resource providers adequately engaged though LFA-based reporting. The grass-root originated vision and empowerment in OM is invaluable if one if to engender community participation, appreciation and ownership of program intentions. The challenge then shifts to the M & E team in how to develop a process, tools and products that will best serve those diverse interests. The capacity demands (+ coordination time) become the limiting factor.