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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research was to support improvements in the quality of evaluations of capacity development initiatives in the international development sector. These improvements should enable greater contribution of evaluation findings to improved capacity development initiatives. To achieve this, the research is designed to determine whether the application of one of the available frameworks assists the evaluation of capacity development initiatives.

Adoption of an effective capacity development approach is seen as critical to reducing poverty through international development assistance activities (World Bank, 2005). As a result, global annual investment in capacity development now exceeds USD30 billion (World Bank Institute, 2012). However, capacity development results have been questionable, and evaluation findings have contributed little to addressing this due to their poor quality. Therefore, there is an urgent need to improve the quality of evaluations of capacity development.

To assist improve the quality of capacity development evaluations, this research tested a framework (the Capacity Development Evaluation (CDE) Framework) for evaluation of capacity development to determine whether it: (i) provided the information and (ii) demonstrated the characteristics stakeholders required, and (iii) addressed the weaknesses with evaluations of capacity development identified in the literature. To complete this, two distinct research phases were adopted. The first phase identified the information users of evaluation findings required from an evaluation and the characteristics they wanted a framework to demonstrate. The second phase then sought to identify whether application of the CDE Framework assists the evaluation of capacity development initiatives.

In Phase 2, the rationale for selecting the CDE Framework from the available frameworks and the rationale for adopting a case study approach are explained and three case studies presented. These case studies capture initiatives of different sizes and aid modalities, which support different sectors in different countries. These initiatives were also characterised by different management structures, levels of resources for M&E and the stage in the project life cycle at which the CDE Framework was introduced.

As each stakeholder may perceive the value of a framework differently, this research has adopted an interpretivist approach using qualitative methods to obtain the rich data required for both Phase 1 and 2. Care has been taken to identify and include in both Phases representatives from all intended user groups, thus avoiding the narrow perspective inherent in
the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) Criteria consequent on their development being undertaken solely by donors. Reflecting the role of the intended user in determining the value of the framework, the criteria used to assess the quality of this research were those identified by intended users: the robustness of the research and transferability of the research findings. A range of methods have been adopted to enable these quality criteria to be met.

Data was collected from those involved in implementing or using evaluations through semi-structured interviews. In addition, for each case study, data was collected from documents prepared for either the partner, donor or implementing team. Draft findings for each case study and each research stage were provided to all involved and others who had expressed interest. Findings were also presented at a series of stakeholder workshops. In addition, findings were progressively presented at relevant conferences and published in a peer reviewed journal. This formed part of an extensive member checking and peer review process.

The research found that the CDE Framework provided most of the information and demonstrated the characteristics required by stakeholders. Users of the CDE Framework believed that it had significantly improved both the evaluation and the quality of the initiative. Application of the CDE Framework had addressed the weaknesses with previous evaluations identified in the literature. Significantly, the Framework had enabled early identification of what was not working on each initiative. As a result of these factors, many who had used the CDE Framework on the case studies had already applied the Framework elsewhere.

This research clearly demonstrated that application of the CDE Framework assists the evaluation of capacity development initiatives. This was through the simplicity of the Framework which facilitates clarity and shared understanding, and provision of both performance and process information. In addition, the research has addressed a number of areas in the literature where there has been an absence of information. The research also identified that the DAC Criteria do not meet the information needs of users.
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ON CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH

I remember one morning when I discovered a cocoon in the bark of a tree, just as the butterfly was making a hole in its case and preparing to come out. I waited a while, but it was too long appearing and I was impatient. I bent over it and breathed on it to warm it. I warmed it as quickly as I could and the miracle began to happen before my eyes, faster than life. The case opened, the butterfly started slowly crawling out and I shall never forget my horror when I saw how its wings were folded back and crumpled; the wretched butterfly tried with its whole trembling body to unfold them. Bending over it, I tried to help it with my breath. In vain.

It needed to be hatched out patiently and the unfolding of the wings should be a gradual process in the sun. Now it was too late. My breath had forced the butterfly to appear, all crumpled, before its time. It struggled desperately and, a few seconds later, died in the palm of my hand. That little body is, I do believe, the greatest weight I have on my conscience. For I realize today that it is a mortal sin to violate the great laws of nature. We should not hurry, we should not be impatient, but we should confidently obey the eternal rhythm.

We should confidently obey the eternal rhythm.

From the novel, Zorba the Greek by Nikos Kazantzakis.
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</tr>
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## GLOSSARY

**Capacity**
The ability of people, organizations and society as a whole to manage their affairs successfully (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development [OECD], 2006).

**Capacity development**
The process whereby people, organizations, and society as a whole unleash, strengthen, create, adapt, and maintain capacity over time (OECD, 2006).

**Facility**
A form of aid, designed to develop relationships between the donor and partner, and/or improve the donors ability to influence policy. Change in capacity and/or performance at occurs at an activity level rather than at the Facility level. These high level objectives are mutually agreed upon with partners and then a flexible planning and responsive approach to emerging priorities enables participants to undertake a range of activities (AusAID, 2009a, p. iv; Dawson, 2009).

**Initiative**
A donor funded project, program or facility.

**Intended user**
The expected users of the findings of this research. This includes those who design, implement, manage, monitor and evaluate international development assistance initiatives, and managers from the donor and partner agency.

**Partner**
The country in which an initiative is being implemented. Also known as recipient, counterpart or host.
Context
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

Capacity development is recognized as critical to successfully lift people out of poverty and has been described as the only way to achieve sustainable poverty alleviation. Consequently, there is now over USD30 billion being spent annually on capacity development (World Bank Institute [WBI], 2012). Despite this, donors have consistently identified that capacity development has generally failed (Asian Development Bank [ADB], 2007; Austria, 2011; Danish International Development Agency [DANIDA], 2010; Wood et. al., 2011; World Bank [WB], 1998 and 2005). Evaluations have contributed little to addressing this as capacity development is rarely evaluated (Watson, 2006; World Bank, 2005 and 2012) and those evaluations conducted are usually of poor quality (DANIDA, 2010; Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation [Norad], 2012; Sorensen & Thulstrup, 2012; Wood et. al, 2011). Consequently, improving the quality of capacity development evaluations will provide information that will enable initiatives to advance capacity development.

To support enhanced capacity development evaluation, this research considered the evaluation of capacity development in international development programs. Specifically, the research sought to determine whether application of a framework specifically designed for the evaluation of capacity development met users’ needs, and consequently should support improved quality capacity development evaluations. As a number of frameworks were published in the literature during the research period, this research was expanded to build a general theory of the characteristics any framework for evaluation of capacity development required to meet users’ needs.

Over the last 15 - 20 years, the focus of development assistance has moved to provision of support for what is known as capacity building (or capacity development). This move was due to individual agencies recognising the dependency of sustainability on capacity development (for example, Hunt, 2005; United Nations Development Program [UNDP], 1997; WB, 2005). This is reflected in the United Nations [UN] agreement:

that capacity development and ownership of national development strategies are essential for the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals, and calls upon United Nations organizations to provide further support to the efforts of developing countries to establish and/or maintain effective national institutions and to support the
implementation and, as necessary, the devising of national strategies for capacity-building. (Para 26, General Assembly Resolution 59/250, December 2004)

This position has continued to be reinforced at an international level. For example, the Paris Declaration (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development [OECD], 2005) emphasised the significance of capacity development in achieving development targets. In 2008, the UNDP identified that “achievement of the Millennium Development Goals and other international and national development targets hinges on the capacities of individuals, organisations and societies to transform, in order to reach their development objectives” (UNDP, 2008, p. 2). Even the latest evaluation of the Paris Declaration (Wood et al., 2011, p. xiv) reported, “The complex, long-term challenges of capacity development are the most important constraints for most countries”.

As a result, there has been a move to make capacity development a core element of activities development assistance agencies support (Whyte, 2004). Through this focus, the annual international development expenditure on capacity development is now estimated at over $30 billion (WBI, 2012). However, the most recent evaluation of the Paris Declaration (Wood et al., 2011) reported that progress in institutional capacity development was generally limited and uneven, with difficulty in attribution of gains to donor support. In addition, evaluation is not contributing to improving this situation as capacity and the development of capacity are rarely evaluated, and, where either are evaluated, the quality of the evaluation is often found to be poor (Bollen et al., 2005; Forss and Carlsson, 1997; Otoo et al., 2009; Oxford Policy Management, 2006; Picciotto, 2003; Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency [SIDA], 2008; Watson, 2006). Clearly, there is a need to improve the quality of capacity development initiatives and the evaluation of these initiatives.

Personal experience and anecdotal discussions with monitoring and evaluation (M&E) advisers, donors and partner agencies reflects what has been reported in the literature. M&E advisers expressed concern that approaches in the international development assistance sector were often trend rather than evidence based. This is reflected by Whyte (2004, p. 18) in the statement “Donors, especially bilateral and multilateral agencies, can exhibit somewhat of a pack mentality when an influential organisation like the World Bank leads the charge”. Consequently, many M&E advisers were concerned that they would be directed by a donor to apply a particular untested model for evaluation of capacity development; their previous
experience in this situation was not positive. From these discussions, practitioners clearly needed better guidance on M&E of capacity development and a rigorously tested framework for undertaking such evaluations.

However, when this research commenced, there was little guidance on M&E of capacity development and no tested frameworks available for the evaluation of capacity development. Testing potential frameworks was complicated by the absence of information in the literature on the criteria against which a framework for evaluation of capacity development could be assessed or the information required by users of such evaluation findings. The dissatisfaction with current evaluations indicates that the most widely used criteria, the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) Criteria and DAC Principals (OECD – DAC, 1991), do not appear to meet the needs of users.

In this context, this research makes a significant contribution to the body of knowledge and practice of evaluation of capacity development by:

- Establishing the information users required from evaluations of capacity development.
- Identifying the characteristics that users require a useful framework for evaluation of capacity development to demonstrate.
- Testing a framework for evaluation of capacity development against these criteria to determine the framework’s utility.
- Identifying a framework that addresses the weaknesses identified with the quality of current evaluations of capacity development.

Application of this knowledge will support improvements in the quality of the evaluation of capacity development, and in turn, capacity development itself.

THE RESEARCH QUESTION

The overarching research question this thesis seeks to answer is:

Does application of one of the available frameworks assist the evaluation of capacity development initiatives? If so, how does it do this?

To answer this question, this research employed a two-phased approach. The first phase identified the characteristics stakeholders would use to assess the value of the framework and information the users of evaluation findings want evaluations of capacity development to
provide. For this, semi-structured interviews were applied to collect data from those involved in the design or implementation of capacity development initiatives. The findings from this phase were analysed; validated through series of workshops with those who design, implement or evaluate capacity development initiatives; and reported.

The second research phase determined whether these criteria were met when a framework for evaluation of capacity development was applied to a particular initiative. The Capacity Development Evaluation (CDE) Framework, a model developed previously by the researcher (Kotvojs, 2009) was assessed. This phase adopted a case study approach with three distinct cases; two in Indonesia and one in Solomon Islands. Data was collected over a three-year period from mid 2010 using document review and, from those directly involved in the three case studies, through semi-structured interviews. The findings from this phase were analysed and then reported to those involved in each case study. Their comments are incorporated before a cross-case analysis was completed.

STRUCTURE OF THESIS

This document is presented in several sections:

• Introduction (Chapter 1) provides an overview of the research.

• Literature review (Chapter 2) considers capacity development in an international development context, its evaluation and tools to support its evaluation. This section concludes with a summary of the issues that emerge from the literature review and the direction for this research.

• Research strategy and methodology (Chapter 3) discusses philosophical approaches to evaluation and research and then describes the methodological implications of the philosophical approach (which focus on use of findings and case studies) and the rationale for the two phases. The chapter presents a broad outline of each phase and the research methodology.

• First phase (Chapter 4) sets out the methodology for determining the characteristics users of any framework for evaluation of capacity development would apply to assess the utility of the framework and the information they want evaluations of capacity development to provide. The findings in relation to these are presented and discussed.
• Second phase (Chapter 5) sets out the methodology applied to each of three case studies to determine whether application of the CDE Framework provided the information users require and demonstrated the characteristics users specified. The findings for each of the case studies are presented and discussed.

• Cross-case analysis (Chapter 6) presents the findings for a cross-case analysis of these three case studies and considers alternative explanations.

• Implications of these findings for evaluation of capacity development are discussed (Chapter 7). This discussion also considers the criteria any framework for evaluation of capacity development must reflect to meet users’ needs.

This thesis now presents an overview of the literature related to evaluation of capacity development in an international development context. The research findings will show that the current policy context may well be undermining capacity development evaluation practice. Adopting a different approach could overcome many of the concerns with evaluation of capacity development and contribute to improved capacity development initiatives.
CHAPTER 2. EVALUATION OF CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT IN AN INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT

This research seeks to positively influence the quality of evaluations of capacity development in an international development context. To achieve this, the research asks:

Does application of one of the available frameworks assist the evaluation of capacity development initiatives? If so, how does it do this?

The question is predicated on current modalities of capacity development evaluation practice applied to international development. To provide a contextual base for understanding and developing the research question, this chapter discusses the emergence of the concepts of capacity and capacity development and how this history influenced today’s understanding of these concepts. The understanding of these concepts (or lack thereof) has significant implications for the approaches taken to evaluating capacity development in an international development context. These different approaches and the frameworks that have recently emerged for evaluation of capacity development are discussed. In addition, the weaknesses identified in reviews of capacity development evaluations and the available models for these evaluations are presented.

The introduction of quality standards for evaluations would be expected to correct many of these weaknesses - however, the weaknesses remain. This is despite evaluations in an international development context usually being undertaken within a policy framework that specifies the standards and the key evaluation questions to be answered. These standards and evaluation questions are discussed, along with the broader policy context of evaluation of capacity development.

Extensive literature reviews were undertaken in 2008, 2013 and 2014. These utilised a number of search engines through the Educational Resources Information Centre (ERIC) to identify contemporary literature. Since much of the relevant material is unpublished, searches for this material also included using: Google, web sites for multilateral and bilateral agencies\(^1\) and a

---

\(^1\) Including websites for the multilateral agencies of Asian Development Bank [ADB], European Union [EU], OECD-DAC, United Nations and the World Bank [WB]), and for bilateral development agencies of the governments of Austria, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Japan, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom and United States of America.
range of evaluation and capacity development websites\(^2\). In addition, material was sought from other professionals working in the sector.

**EMERGENCE OF CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT AS A DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE APPROACH**

In international development, capacity development has evolved out of a range of approaches to the provision of development assistance in developing countries. Until the 1960s, development assistance was largely provided through institution-building\(^3\) activities, which primarily focused on establishment of new public sector institutions that could deliver the functions of the state. In this context, capacity was seen as the capacity of staff, and capacity building was equated with training. Consequently, support was largely through training of staff (particularly at universities in western countries), technical assistance and financing infrastructure activities (La fontaine, 2000; Lusthaus et al., 1999; UNDP, 1997; Whyte, 2004). As this approach was built on the premise that developing countries did not have existing capacities in this area, the expertise to support institution-building was largely imported from western countries. Generally this expertise ignored the local context in which it was operating and applied models and systems from the west with little modification. Consequently institution building approaches often imposed western models that were inappropriate to the context.

As these institutions were established, there was a growing awareness that they were not being built from a zero base, rather there were existing capacities or foundations that could be built-upon. Recognising this, by the 1970s the approach had moved to that of institution-

---

\(^2\) Web sites for:

- multilateral agencies included the Asian Development Bank [ADB], European Union [EU], OECD-DAC, United Nations and the World Bank [WB]),

- bilateral agencies included those for the development agencies of the governments of Austria, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Japan, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom and United States of America


\(^3\) The definition of institution building is debated, however it can be considered to be the efforts to improve the way in which societies function by creating, strengthening or changing the way people relate to one another through public actions and activities. This is broader than working within an organisation (Moore et al., 1995).
strengthening (La fontaine, 2000; Lusthaus et al., 1999; Whyte, 2004). However, institutions continued to be considered in isolation from their context with strengthening focussed on improving internal functioning and performance through training and the introduction of various tools from the west. Local involvement in strengthening organisations increased.

At the same time, there was recognition in many developing countries that the institutions established had largely ignored the poor. This acknowledgement led to the emergence of the concept of people-centred development with donors focusing more on the social development and human needs of the poor. Institutions were strengthened to deliver services that were aimed at meeting the basic human needs (such as health, water and education) of those people previously neglected (UNDP, 1997, p. 5).

During the 1980s and 1990s, this focus on those neglected by the public sector moved the development approach towards that of new institutionalism (La fontaine, 2000; Lusthaus et al., 1999; UNDP, 1997; Whyte, 2004). Under this approach, support to reform the public sector was designed with consideration of the local, institutional, national and global context (Powell, 2007). This led to recognition of the linkages between institutions, sectoral and macro-policy issues. Consequently capacity development addressed the relevant networks in addition to the organisation. During this period, there was an emphasis on institutional change, institutional restructure and structural adjustment programs.

In parallel with this, the failure of much of the development assistance previously provided was more widely acknowledged (Berg, 1993; Dollar and Pritchett, 1998; Japan International Cooperation Agency [JICA], 2003; UNDP, 1997). For example, the World Bank reported (Berg, 1993, p. 244) that:

In few areas of policy are the costs of inaction or misguided action more far-reaching ...

Almost everybody acknowledges the ineffectiveness of technical cooperation in what is or should be its major objective: achievement of greater self-reliance in the recipient countries by building institutions and strengthening local capacities in national economic management.

---

4 The terms institutional strengthening and institutional development are often used interchangeably (La fontaine, 2000, p. 124; Lusthaus et al., 1999, p. 2; Whyte, 2004, p. 19).
This recognition of failure led donor’s to consider the causes of development assistance failures and increased attention on sustainability (JICA, 2003). Factors that influenced sustainability were researched, leading to recognition of the importance of local ownership and the need to take a holistic approach to systems. Both of these aspects required the capacity of all elements of the system in which the institution operated to be developed. The resultant outcome was the emergence of capacity development as a new and separate development approach (Lavergne & Saxbyl, 2001, p. 1) which was presented as the solution to the failure of development assistance (UNDP, 1997).

As capacity development emerged, elements of former approaches to development such as institutional building, institutional strengthening, development management, human resource development and new institutionalism were aggregated into the concept of capacity development. In addition, capacity development absorbed the ideas and approaches of sustainable development, integrated rural development, community development, institutional development and people centred development (Lusthaus, 1999, p. 2; Whyte, 2004, p. 19). Concurrently, concepts of empowerment, social capital and an enabling environment were gaining greater attention and these ideas were also subsumed into the construct of capacity development. Thus, for many, capacity development had come to encompass everything, and consequently some academics considered the term no longer had value: “when it is claimed to be everything, it adds up to nothing” (Morgan, 2006, p. 5).

Further compounding the complexity of the emerging concept of capacity development was the move towards capacity development being seen as an objective in its own right, rather than only as a means to achieve other project objectives. Increasingly capacity development became the central goal of development assistance programs so that by the early 2000s, capacity development had emerged as a core element of most development assistance (Whyte, 2004, p. 19).

THE CONCEPTS OF CAPACITY AND CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT

Partially as a consequence of the evolution of the concept of capacity and capacity development, no universal definition of capacity has been established (Morgan, 2006). As a result, a range of distinct definitions are used (Box 1), generally with organisations developing a definition that reflects their internalised policy positions. For example, the United Nations
agencies focus on sustainable development, the Netherlands on equity, and Sweden on the conditions required for development (Whyte, 2004).

**Box 1. Examples of definitions of capacity.**

ECDPM: capacity is that emergent combination of attributes, capabilities and relationships that enables a system to exist, adapt and perform (Watson, 2006, p. 15).

Netherlands: the ability of an organisation to produce appropriate outputs. (Boesen & Therkildsen, 2004, p. 10).

OECD (also now adopted by Asian Development Bank [2007], DFAT [AusAID, 2006], Austria [2011]; SIDA [Salomonsson et al., 2011]); capacity is the ability of people, organizations and society as a whole to manage their affairs successfully (OECD, 2006, p. 12).

SIDA: the concept of capacity is an overall concept for the conditions that must be in place – for example, knowledge, competence, and effective and development orientated organisational and institutional frameworks – in order to make development possible. These conditions can change and the concept must therefore provide concrete content from case to case (SIDA, 2000, p. 21).

UN: capacity is the ability of individuals, communities, institutions, organisations, and social and political systems to use the natural, financial, political, social and human resources that are available to them for the definition and pursuit of sustainable development (UNDG, 2002, p. 5).

UNDP: capacity is the ability of individuals, organisations, and societies to perform functions, solve problems, and set and achieve goals (UNDP, 1997, p. 3).

World Bank: No definition of capacity (World Bank, 2010).

Despite these differences in definitions of capacity there are many common elements. For example, skills and capabilities; self-reliance/sustainability over the long term through an ability to respond to challenges; and its application to individuals, communities, organisations and even societies (Alliance, 2003; OECD, 2006; United Nations Development Group [UNDG], 2002; UNDP, 2010; Woodland & Hind, 2002; WBI, 2012). Many of these elements are captured in the OECD’s (2006) definition that capacity is “the ability of people, organizations and society as a whole to manage their affairs successfully”. This simple, widely (though not universally) accepted
definition will be used in this research. For Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID), capacity is measured through demonstrated performance (AusAID, 2006, p. 2).

Three terms emerged to describe change in capacity: capacity building, capacity development and capacity enhancement. Capacity building was the first of these terms and from its introduction there was a great breadth in its conceptualisation (Box 2). Consequently, as early as 1993 the literature had identified that through inconsistent use, the term capacity building had already lost its analytical power and that even then, establishing an agreed definition may not be possible (Cohen, 1993). Since then, despite the growth in usage of capacity building as a descriptor of development approaches, there remains no agreed definition.

**Box 2. Examples of agencies’ definition of capacity building or capacity development.**

AusAID: the process of developing competencies and capabilities in individuals, groups, organisations, sectors or countries which will lead to sustained and self generating performance improvement (AusAID, 2006, p. 2).

ECDPM (2006): Undefined to avoid confusion because of the many ways it is used.

OECD [also adopted by Asian Development Bank (2008); Austria (2011); SIDA (Salomonsson C et al., 2011)]: the process whereby people, organizations, and society as a whole unleash, strengthen, create, adapt, and maintain capacity over time (OECD, 2006, p. 12).

UNDP: Capacity development is the process through which individuals, leaders, organisations and societies, obtain, strengthen and maintain the capabilities to set and achieve their own development objectives over time (UNDP, 2008, p. 8).

World Bank: There was no corporate wide definition for capacity building in 2005 (World Bank, 2005). By 2010, they adopted the definition: The locally driven process of learning by leaders, coalitions and other agents of change that brings about changes in socio-political, policy-related, and organizational factors to enhance local ownership for and the effectiveness and efficiency of efforts to achieve a development goal. (World Bank, 2010, p. 3).

As the terms capacity development and capacity enhancement crept into the lexicon, they too had no universally agreed definitions, with the meaning of each varying widely among users. Some considered that capacity building implied that capacity is built from nothing whereas they interpreted the term capacity development to reflect the improvement of existing capacities
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(OECD, 2006, p. 12; UNDP, 2008, p. 4). The World Bank states that capacity enhancement adds a time dimension to capacity (Mizrahi, 2004), but did not go on to define it more specifically. In practice, for many years most agencies used the phrases interchangeably (Kumasi Institute of Technology, Energy and Environment, 2010; UNDP, 2008; Watson, 2006; Whyte, 2004), although some agencies used specific terms. For example, United Nations used capacity development and the World Bank used capacity enhancement (Whyte, 2004). The Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade [DFAT] (AusAID, 2006) maintain a definition for capacity building rather than capacity development, while they generally use the term capacity development. Today, capacity development seems to have emerged as the most widely used term, possibly as a result of its use in the Paris Declaration (OECD, 2005). For example, Asian Development Bank [ADB] (2008), UNDP (2010) and the World Bank (2010) now use this term. However, the terminology debate continues to the extent that:

A cynic might say that some donors are more concerned to finesse the differences between these three terms than to tackle the bigger and more fundamental question of what theory of change underlies their new awareness of capacity development and participatory approaches in providing overseas development assistance and technical cooperation (Whyte, 2004, p. 23).

Further exacerbating the confusion is the absence of clear consistency of definition across any one of these terms. For example, as shown in Box 2, some organisations have focussed the definition of capacity development on learning (World Bank), some on capability (UNDP) and others have made a conscious decision not to use the term due to the surrounding confusion (ECDPM). Even within a single organisation there is often an inconsistent use of the term. As an example, since July 2007, the OECD Glossary (2006) has defined capacity development as “The process by which individuals, groups and organisations, institutions and countries develop, enhance and organise their systems, resources and knowledge; all reflected in their abilities, individually and collectively, to perform functions, solve problems and achieve objectives”. However, other OECD documents (for example, OECD, 2007 & 2011) use the definition set out in Box 2. This diversity of definitions has led to expression of the sentiment that “the lack of clarity about capacity development encourages people to use the term as a slogan rather than as a meaningful concept to improve understanding of the process” (Lusthaus et. al, 1999, p. 9).
Despite this, common across all definitions is the inclusion of the word, “process”; the concept that capacity captures ability at a point in time and capacity development captures the process by which this changes. For example, an individual’s capacity may refer to their ability to develop an outcomes budget for a government department. In this case, capacity development would refer to the process used to enable the person to develop an outcomes budget to the required quality. This process may involve various forms of training, development of procedures or introduction of a database that captures the data required to inform the budget. Thus, the objective of a capacity development initiative: “is not to supply a product or service but to foster the development of specific individuals and organizations” (Horton, 2002, p. 5).

Therefore, to capture the notion that capacity may already exist and development assistance is building on what is already there, this research will use the term “capacity development” rather than capacity building. The definition adopted has been that proposed by OECD: “Capacity development is the process whereby people, organizations, and society as a whole unleash, strengthen, create, adapt, and maintain capacity over time”; the most widely used definition across the sector (OECD, 2006, p. 12).

INVESTMENT IN CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT

As a result of the perceived importance of capacity development in achieving sustainable outcomes, by the early 2000s, capacity development had emerged as a core element of initiatives supported by most development assistance agencies. For example, AusAID stated that “capacity building is integral to almost everything AusAID does; it is at the centre of our development aspirations” (AusAID, 2003, p. 1) and by 2008, 75% of World Food Program initiatives directly supported capacity development (2008, pi). More widely, it is estimated that as early as 2006, over 20% of donor funds were committed to capacity development (OECD, 2009a). Many donors allocated an even greater proportion of their budget to capacity development. For example, some 40% of USAID and AusAID expenditure on technical cooperation (OECD, 2009a) and 50% of World Bank (2005) funds for Africa were spent on capacity development. When these figures are translated into budget amounts, the World Bank estimated donors spent more than $20 billion annually on capacity development activities in 2009 (Otoo et al., 2009). By 2012, this estimate had increased to over $30 billion (WBI, 2012).

Despite this significant investment, in the limited number of evaluations conducted, capacity development was shown to be largely unsuccessful (Otoo et al., 2009; Watson, 2006; World
Bank, 2005). For example, only 30-40% of the capacity development effort by the World Bank in the late 1990s was found to have been effective (Dollar and Pritchett, 1998) and achievements generally continued below expectations across Africa (World Bank, 2005, p. xv). More significantly, not only were capacity development initiatives seen as unsuccessful, but many initiatives were seen to be adversely affecting capacity in recipient countries. This was reflected by Edward Jaycox, a former Vice President of the World Bank, concluding that “Donors and African governments together have in effect undermined capacity in Africa; they are undermining it faster than they are building it.” (World Bank, 2005, p. 7).

Little has improved since then, with reviews consistently showing capacity development initiatives to be largely ineffective. For example, the Asian Development Bank has since described their efforts at capacity building as “not fully effective” (ADB, 2007, p. 4). A review of Belgium’s investment in capacity development activities implemented through 40 Non government organisation (NGO) partnerships found only a third showed a clear contribution to capacity development (Kingdom of Belgium, 2010). Denmark’s review of their capacity development efforts over the 13 years to 2009 showed limited achievement across national government organisations but somewhat better results at community level and with local governments (Danish International Development Agency [DANIDA], 2010, p. 64). In 2011, the World Bank concluded that the failure of capacity development initiatives meant they needed to fundamentally change the approach they adopted to capacity development (WBI, 2011, p. vii).

At the same time, Austria (Austria Development Cooperation, 2011, p. 3) introduced Capacity Development Guidelines to try to improve outcomes. The recent evaluation of Paris Declaration (Wood et al., 2011) found that progress in institutional capacity development continued to be limited and uneven, and attribution of gains to donor support was difficult. Clearly, there remains a need to improve the quality of capacity development initiatives. The findings of evaluations of capacity development initiatives provide a mechanism to support such improvements.

**CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT EVALUATION PRACTICE**

With large investments in, and poor outcomes of, capacity development, there could be an expectation that capacity and the development of capacity would be regularly evaluated. The findings of these evaluations would enable identification of capacity development achievements and ways in which initiatives could be modified to improve capacity development outcomes.
However, capacity development is rarely evaluated (Watson, 2006, p. 3; WB, 2005, p. 17). For example, the World Bank (2005, p. xiv) noted that most of its capacity development activities “are not routinely tracked, monitored or evaluated”. As a consequence, there was a lack of information about the veracity of assumptions upon which designs are based, how different capacity development strategies work, effective and ineffective capacity development practice, and whether capacity development efforts addressed local priorities. Accordingly, the World Bank concluded that they often continued to implement unsuitable activities (Otoo et al., 2009). Thus, the application of findings from improved evaluation of capacity development initiatives should lead to enhanced capacity development outcomes.

The lack of policy relating to evaluation of capacity development initiatives and the lack of specific tools to support these evaluations, may contribute to the failure to regularly monitor and evaluate capacity development. In addition, these factors contribute to the generally poor quality of the capacity development evaluations that have been conducted. In turn, this is likely to have contributed to the limited application of these findings to improve capacity development practice.

**Evaluation policy in an international development context.**

There is no agreed policy in relation to evaluation of capacity development in the international development sector. Instead, evaluation of capacity development is generally considered within the broader evaluation policy for international development initiatives. This broader policy is based upon the definition for evaluation developed in 1991 by the DAC as:

> an assessment, as systematic and objective as possible, of an on-going or completed project, program or policy, its design, implementation and results. The aim is to determine the relevance and fulfilment of objectives, developmental efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability (OECD, 1991, p. 5).

From this definition, five key evaluation questions (known as the DAC Criteria) for development programs emerged. These questions are: what is the program’s relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability? Since they were first established, these evaluation questions have become the most widely used questions for evaluation of development assistance initiatives among bi- and multi-lateral donors (Chianca, 2008a).
The DAC also established the Principles for Evaluation of Development Assistance in 1991 with the intent of improving the quality of evaluations. The Principles were seen by the DAC members as “the most important requirements of the evaluation process based on current policies and practices as well as donor agency experiences with evaluation and feedback of results” (OECD, 1991, p. 4). The Principles that relate to evaluation are:

- Impartiality and independence: the evaluation should be impartial and independent of policy making, the delivery and management of development assistance.
- Credibility: using evaluators with credibility and relevant expertise and a transparent evaluation process.
- Usefulness: evaluations must be perceived as relevant and useful and be presented in a clear and concise way.
- Participation of donors and recipients: donors and recipients should be involved in the evaluation process.

These Criteria and Standards were developed by the heads of evaluation units from almost all bilateral and multilateral agencies operating at that time (Chianca, 2008b); a group comprised solely of western, developed nations (OECD DAC, 1991). As such, it excluded representatives from partner countries, managers of initiatives (either donor managers at a country level or those outside the M&E Unit, partner country and managing contractors), and those involved in day-to-day implementation. Thus, the DAC Criteria reflect the values of well-educated, western managers from high socio-economic levels. However, numerous researchers (for example, Krippner et al., 2012; Longest et al., 2013; and Schwartz et al., 2012) have identified that values, and therefore what is considered important, are dependent on an individual’s socio-economic status, role, power, gender, religion and national culture. Consequently, the DAC Criteria will only reflect what a small segment of stakeholders consider important in international development implementation and outcomes, let alone what is important in capacity development.

An extensive search of literature identified that only Chianca (2008b) has reported weaknesses in the DAC Criteria. His proposal to expand the DAC Criteria to consider quality of process was rejected by Eggers (2009); a member of the Working Party that developed the Criteria. Following Eggers rebuttal, excluding publications resulting from this research (Kotvojs & Hurworth, 2011
and 2013), no other authors appear to have proposed revisions to the DAC Criteria. In addition, this research could not identify any research or evaluations that considered whether use of the DAC Criteria improved the evaluation’s quality. This may stem from donors undertaking most reviews of the quality of international development evaluations. Their focus is on an evaluation’s compliance with the DAC Criteria rather than whether the criteria meet users’ needs (for example AusAID, 2012a, Bazeley 2011; Cahn, 2010; Commonwealth of Australia, 2011).

Over time, the OECD has reviewed the Principles for Evaluation of Development Assistance and recommended they be further reviewed to reflect the changes in delivery of development assistance (OECD, 1998, p. 7; OECD, 2011). However, the only change that has occurred was the extension of the criteria for complex emergencies which increased focus on what should be included in each of the original five Principles and incorporated an additional two Principles (coherence and coverage) (OECD, 1999).

While OECD introduced Evaluation Standards to complement the Principles and “inform evaluation processes and products” (OECD, 2010, p. 6), these Standards did not mention capacity development (other than the potential for the evaluation process to develop local M&E capacity). They also described implementation of the evaluation rather than set Quality Standards. Thus, apart from the 1999 extension to the Principles, in the almost 25 years since they were developed the Criteria and Principles have remained unaltered despite significant changes in the context in which many development assistance initiatives operate and the type of development assistance delivered.

Consequently, although the focus of international development has largely moved to capacity development and there has been recognition that “conventional M&E Systems regularly fail to capture the impact” of capacity development activities and are inappropriate (WBI, 2012, p. 9), none of the OECD-DAC documents relating to evaluation policy, principles or standards includes criteria or themes associated with evaluation of capacity development. Similarly, no specific reference to capacity development was found in evaluation policy documents and guidelines of a range of bi – and multi - lateral donors (Appendix A). However, a number of multilateral donors, including the World Bank and UNDP, have very recently introduced specific reference to evaluation of capacity development (Otoo et. al, 2009 and UNDP, 2010).
Tools to support evaluation of capacity development.

The absence of policy on evaluation of capacity has been accompanied by an absence of tools to support evaluation of capacity development. Until recently, the M&E frameworks available did not consider capacity development and some authors proposed that the specific characteristics of capacity development initiatives led to a “need to develop a unique framework for the planning, M&E of capacity development” (Lusthaus et al., 1999, p. 15). Regardless of whether the framework was unique to evaluation of capacity development, it was agreed that “Further development of tools to support M&E for [capacity development] is crucial” (La fontaine, 2000, p. 89). This need for specific tools to support evaluations of capacity development continued unmet for many years.

By 2006, there had been no improvement in provision of support for evaluation of capacity development. Morgan (2006, p. 4) identified that “practitioners still appear to be searching for tested tools or frameworks that can help them with ... M&E [of capacity development]”. Despite the emergence of capacity development frameworks over an almost 10 year period (for example; Alliance [2003]), New South Wales Health Department [Hawe et al., 1999]; OECD [1995]; UNDP [1997]), none included information to support evaluation of capacity development. More broadly, as multilateral and bi-lateral agencies such as OECD (2006), SIDA (2004), UNDG (2006) and the UNDP (1997) introduced capacity development, they provided little, if any, practical guidance on how to evaluate capacity development activities. Thus, capacity development initiatives were being introduced without an understanding of how they should be evaluated.

This researcher undertook an extensive review of literature in 2008 to identify any models or frameworks for evaluation of capacity development\(^5\). In addition, evaluators on a range of initiatives funded by the Governments of Australia and New Zealand, ADB and World Bank (including capacity development programs) were asked to identify models or frameworks of which they knew. The only reference found in the literature (published or unpublished) or identified in discussions was to AusAID’s Staged Capacity Development Model (AusAID, 2006).

\(^5\) This included searching all editions since 2000 of: Evaluation; New Directions for Evaluation; Journal of Evaluation and Program Planning; Education Policy, Planning and Administration Journal; the American Journal of Evaluation; the Canadian Journal of Development Studies; the Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation; the Australasian Journal of Program Evaluation and the Journal of Public Administration and Research. In addition, a range of sources of unpublished literature were also searched.
AusAID’s Staged Capacity Development Model has a very narrow conceptual basis limited to the competency of individuals and work groups to undertake a specific function (AusAID, 2006). The model did not consider whether the individual/work group was able to learn new functions or solve problems – both key elements of many definitions of capacity. The capacity development tools identified in the Staged Capacity Development Model were all training based tools. Thus, it remains focused on the ‘old’ concept of capacity development.

Subsequent extensive literature reviews undertaken in 2013 and 2014\textsuperscript{6} identified several frameworks for M&E of capacity development activities in the international development sector that have more recently emerged. These include:

- The European Centre for Development Policy Management’s (ECDPM) Balanced Framework (Watson, 2006).
- The Capacity Development Results Framework (World Bank, 2010).

Each of these frameworks was designed around the developer’s concept of capacity and capacity development. For example, the Balanced Framework focuses on the five capabilities that ECDPM consider essential for an organisation or system to create value for others. These are: survive and act, generate development results, relate, adapt and self-renew, and achieve and maintain coherence. Contrasting this, the World Bank’s Capacity Development Results Framework considers socio-political, policy-related and organizational change. These are the constraints the World Bank identified to capacity. UNDP’s Capacity Measurement Framework also evaluates capacity development through change in what they understand to limit capacity: institutional arrangements, leadership, knowledge and accountability. The Capacity Development Evaluation (CDE) Framework considers change in individuals, organisations, networks and the enabling environment. The differences in these frameworks reflects the approach proposed 10 years earlier by Lusthaus et al. (1999, p. 14): “If capacity development is going to be more than a development slogan, its practitioners will need to develop approaches

\textsuperscript{6} In addition to searching all editions since 2014 of the journals reviewed in 2008, this also included
to planning, M&E that are congruent with definitions and concepts identified as ‘capacity development’. However, excluding this research, there remains no published literature reporting the testing of these frameworks.

**Quality of evaluation of capacity development.**

Where capacity or capacity development had been evaluated, the literature reported that these evaluations were often of poor quality. This is reflected in findings from reviews of evaluation of capacity development undertaken by a broad range of donors, including:

- A World Bank review of 194 evaluations of capacity development initiatives implemented between 1947 and 2010 that found the evaluation of capacity development was generally weak. Moreover, there was often confusion between outputs, outcomes and results; and inconsistent consideration of capacity development and the challenges to achieving capacity outcomes (WBI, 2011, p. 15).

- The Danish development assistance agency found that during the period 1996 to 2009, evaluations of capacity development initiatives supporting the environment sector were poorly done, with imprecisely defined indicators and targets, and they often reflected little systematic assessment (DANIDA, 2010, p. 9 & 64).

- A review of 13 programs in Africa implemented between 1999 and 2004 by the United Kingdom found capacity development outcomes were not identified as they were rarely monitored (Oxford Policy Management, 2006, p. 5).

- The Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency’s (SIDA) review of 34 reports of evaluations conducted between 2003 and 2005 on initiatives that mostly focused on capacity development, concluded that the quality of evaluations was “by and large not good enough” (Forss et al., 2008, p. 5).

- A review of 41 reports produced in 2010 and 2011 for evaluations of donor assistance provided by Finland found evaluation of capacity development was poorly undertaken (Sorensen & Thulstrup, 2012, p. 27 - 28).

- A review of evaluations undertaken by six Community Service Organisations receiving Norwegian support to develop initiatives with capacity development objectives identified
that 70% of reports did not include an assessment of capacity development and, where it was included, the discussion was weak (Norad, 2012, p. 130).

- The recent evaluation of Paris Declaration (Wood et al., 2011, p. 44) identified a poor chain of evidence for sustainable change in capacity.

Only one review was identified (Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands, 2011) which did not conclude that the quality of capacity development evaluations was poor. This evaluation was very narrow in scope considering only three case studies of support provided by the Government of Netherlands.

Specifications for many of the evaluations considered in these reviews included compliance with the DAC Criteria and Standards. Despite this, the evaluations produced were not of the required quality. More broadly, the application of these Standards has often been reported to be mechanistic, excluding more creative evaluation processes; poorly considered and defined; with findings of limited use to decision makers (Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action [ALNAP], 2006, p. 10; Forss et. al 2008, p. 5-7; Kaplan, 2014).

As with reviews of other evaluations in the international development sector, there was a consistent absence of analytic rigour in evaluations of capacity development regardless of whether the evaluation was undertaken by non-government organisations, bi-lateral agencies or multi-lateral organisations (for example, Bamberger 2000, p. 96 - 97; Bollen et al., 2005, p. 199; Carman, 2007, p. 72; Otoo et al., 2009, p. 1 - 2; Picciotto, 2003, p. 231 - 33). This has led to these and other authors, identifying over a long period that evaluations need significant improvement as summarised in Box 3.

The poor quality of evaluations undertaken has been attributed to the weak capacity of community-based organisations, development banks and donor agencies to evaluate capacity development initiatives (Carman, 2007; La fontaine, 2000; UNDG, 2006; Watson, 2006). These organisations were found to lack capacity in terms of individual’s skills, policy and models to support M&E of capacity development. This was complicated by the absence of M&E frameworks that considered capacity development.
Box 3. Summary of weaknesses in evaluation of capacity development identified in the literature review.

Evaluations of capacity development need to:

1. Promote an outcomes focus. Clearly distinguish outputs and outcomes and move the focus upward from inputs and outputs to outcomes.

2. Establish agreed initiative expectations. Establish clear and agreed expectations about the initiative.

3. Use relevant indicators. Establish agreed, inclusive indicators that focus on both outcomes and progress in areas that can be influenced and which measure progress and results in measures other than changed performance.

4. Establish realistic M&E expectations about what an evaluation can achieve. This includes recognising that outcomes will not be achieved in a short time frame and often not until after the initiative has finished. It is interesting that while many donors recognise this, there remains a demand due to political imperatives to show impacts in the short term.

5. Adopt a duality of purpose. Consider both the outcomes and the process.

6. Address audience needs. Consider the information needs of different audiences.

7. Maintain flexibility rather than rigidity within the evaluation framework.

Even where quality evaluations were conducted, the literature reports that donors rarely used the evaluation findings (Watson, 2006). For example, Sorensen & Thurstrup’s meta-evaluation of 41 evaluations of initiatives funded through Finland’s aid program during 2010 – 2011 “did not find any clear evidence of any systematic follow-up on these evaluation recommendations” (2012, p. 78). Similarly, in identifying key lessons from member country evaluations, the OECD (2013) reported that member countries should improve mechanisms to support use of findings. This is also a challenge for the Australian Aid Program as indicated by a senior DFAT manager:

One of the limitations of AusAID is to feed information out of the evaluation into higher level strategic decision making and initiative level decision-making. The whole idea of evaluation to inform the whole of the aid cycle is really difficult."
This is despite the recognised value in use of findings to support decision-making; a position initially established by the work of Guba and Stufflebeam (1970). Similarly, the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (JCSEE) placement of “utility” in their Standards as the first attribute of a quality evaluation indicates the importance they placed upon use. A member of the JCSEE explained that they believed “utility” was the most important attribute and had a critical place in quality evaluations (Stufflebeam, 1980). He then went so far as to say that if the findings could not be used, the evaluation should not be implemented. More narrowly, within the development sector the recognised value of use was clearly reflected by the inclusion of “Usefulness” as one of the DAC Principles for Evaluation of Development Assistance.

Despite the expressed importance of utility, few assessments of evaluation quality consider whether the findings were actually used (Dabelstein, 1998). For example, neither the reviews of the quality of evaluations of the Australian (Bazeley, 2011) nor the New Zealand (Cahn, 2010) aid programs considered use. Instead, they focused on compliance with the DAC Criteria and Principles.

**SUMMARY OF LESSONS FROM THE LITERATURE**

As reflected in various United Nations resolutions (for example General Assembly Resolution 59/250, December 2004), internationally, capacity development is recognised as central to the sustainable alleviation of poverty. Consequently, the investment in capacity development by donor agencies is extremely high. However, capacity development outcomes are poor, and in some cases, capacity development initiatives have undermined progress towards poverty alleviation. The literature indicates that evaluation findings can make only a negligible contribution to improving the quality of capacity development because these evaluations are rarely undertaken and the few conducted, are generally of poor quality.

While improving the quality of capacity development evaluations would support enhanced capacity development outcomes, the literature demonstrates this is not currently possible. For example, there is no specific policy related to evaluation of capacity development or frameworks demonstrated to support M&E of capacity development; and there is a lack of consistency in definitions of capacity and capacity development and a limited number of individuals with the required skills. Neither the DAC Criteria nor the DAC Principles are likely to contribute to overcoming these constraints as their application to date has failed to address the problems. In addition, neither specifically consider capacity development or the end users’
perspective. Thus, there is a clear need for further research to support capacity development evaluations contribute to realisation of development outcomes.

To address this, the research must identify intended user’s needs. This requires identification of both users’ information needs and the characteristics they require a framework useful for evaluation of capacity development to demonstrate. Following this, a framework’s utility for evaluation of capacity development must be tested against these criteria rather than those of the DAC. With this information, evaluations can provide information to improve the quality of capacity development initiatives.

This research addresses these issues as part of the overarching research question:

Does application of one of the available frameworks assist the evaluation of capacity development initiatives? If so, how does it do this?

The following chapter sets out the research strategy and methodology used to answer this research question. It will also demonstrate why the choice of research strategy is critical to addressing the issues currently experienced in evaluation of capacity development.
CHAPTER 3. OVERARCHING RESEARCH STRATEGY AND METHODOLOGY

The choice of research strategy is critical in answering the research question:

Does application of one of the available frameworks assist the evaluation of capacity development initiatives? If so, how does it do this?

This is because the strategy chosen must not create limitations similar to those experienced by the DAC Criteria; limitations which arose as a result of the approach used to develop those Criteria. In addition, to enable the research to contribute to improved capacity development, the research strategy adopted should support use of this research’s findings. This chapter will set out the epistemological approach, research strategy and methodology adopted to achieve this. The methodological description is structured around the relevant criteria for assessing the quality of this research. Methodology specific to each phase is discussed in the chapter relevant to that phase.

RESEARCH STRATEGY

Those who have worked in the international development sector would recognise that the perceived ‘reality’ of an initiative is generally different for each stakeholder group. In addition, significant differences often exist within each stakeholder group. This is well demonstrated in the change of initiative direction; or perceived success, strengths and weaknesses of an initiative or the value of a specific approach, that can follow the replacement of a key stakeholder such as a partner government decision maker or donor manager (Baser, 2008; Whyte, 2004). Consequently, a research strategy must adopt an approach that reflects a multiplicity of ‘realities’.

This situation, where truth is determined by human judgement with meaning influenced by context and derived from the perspective of the observer; where there is no single, absolute, objective truth that can be known, reflects the interpretivist perspective (Carson et al., 2001, p. 6; Ozanne and Hudson, 1989, p. 2). Therefore, the interpretivist perspective has been adopted in this research. In this context, the researcher is not able to determine a single ‘truth’ as there is no single, external reality; reality is only known through perceived knowledge.

Since reality is constructed, different social actors may have a different reality for the same situation; multiple realities exist within the same situation and truth (or reality) will be “in a constant state of change” (Bryman, 2012, p. 33). With this view, the research seeks to define the
reality perceived by those involved through understanding of the specific context and recognises that this will change over time (Carson et al., 2001, p. 6; Ozanne and Hudson, 1989, p. 2). This requires the analysis of qualitative data in order to obtain the richness required to develop a picture of each social actor’s perspective.

The stakeholder’s perspective is important for both establishing the perceived reality during this research, and, as has been shown in the work of Patton (2008), in maximising the likelihood that the research findings will be applied. For this research, application of findings is seen as critical given the literature review’s clear demonstration of the urgent need for improvement in the quality of evaluations of capacity development. Adopting an approach that supports use of research findings is also considered important as the standards (OECD-DAC and JCSEE) most commonly used to evaluate international development initiatives include a focus on use of findings. Therefore to facilitate use, this research strategy applied many elements of the Utilisation Focused Evaluation approach (Patton, 2008). Thus, all decisions regarding design, implementation and reporting of the research, focus on how that decision would affect the use of the research. This reflects Patton’s proposition that: “what happens from the very beginning of a study will determine its eventual impact” (2008, p. 36).

In summary, rather than having their own, external reality, development assistance initiatives (projects, programs or facilities) can be considered a construct of the perceptions and actions of stakeholders (including partner governments, donors, team members). This perceived reality changes over time. In addition, this research recognises that users’ meaning, though subjective, is what is critical. Therefore, the basis on which a framework for evaluation of capacity development is valued is determined by the perception of the intended user about how well the framework meets their needs.

This position leads to adoption of an interpretive approach requiring “the social scientist to grasp the subjective meaning of social action” (Bryman, 2012, p. 712); in this case, grasping the meaning of what information the users of evaluation findings want and whether they believe this information is provided. The interpretivist approach recognises that different users of evaluation findings will each have a different experience of reality and that these experiences are viewed as relative, multiple, socially and experientially based, holistic and divergent (Guba, 1992 as cited in Al Wadi, 2013). This research has therefore sought to identify all relevant
intended user groups and “gain access to people’s common sense thinking and hence to interpret their actions and their social world from their point of view” (Bryman, 2012, p. 30).

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Reflecting the research strategy, this research has adopted a qualitative approach to obtain the rich data that is required to answer the research question. This has been supported by purposive sampling, a phased approach (Figure 1) and use of case studies for Phase 2. The rationale for adopting this sampling strategy and the phased approach is discussed in this section in light of the research strategy. The basis for adopting a case study approach to Phase 2 is discussed in Chapter 5. This section will also identify the relevant intended user groups, present the criteria for assessing the quality of this research and document how this research met these quality criteria.

Figure 1. Research phases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1:</th>
<th>Phase 2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify users’:</td>
<td>Determine whether application of the CDE Framework:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Information needs.</td>
<td>• Provides users’ information needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Desired characteristics of a framework for evaluating capacity development.</td>
<td>• Reflects users’ desired characteristics of a framework for evaluating capacity development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The need for a phased approach.

As discussed in the literature review, development of the DAC Criteria and DAC Standards involved many donors, including AusAID. Therefore, it could be argued that they reflect the information needs of intended users. However, as these Criteria and Standards were only developed by one of the intended user groups – donors – they may not reflect the information needs and requirements of other intended users. In addition, intended users (including donors) do not find that evaluations of development initiatives (and specifically capacity development) provide the information they want (Chapter 2). This suggests that these Criteria and Standards may not reflect the needs of all intended users. Further, as discussed in the literature review, these Criteria were developed before capacity development became a focus of development initiatives and the Criteria have not been revised to incorporate this new focus. Therefore, they may not reflect intended users’ needs with respect to capacity development.
In light of these constraints and the focus of this research on use of findings, the specific criteria used to assess the value of the framework should be those of the intended end users, rather than those developed more than 20 years ago by the DAC. Consequently, this research first identified the information the expected users of the findings of this research (defined as intended users) want evaluations of capacity development to provide and the characteristics they would require a useful framework to demonstrate. These intended users will include those who design, implement, manage, monitor and evaluate international development assistance initiatives, and managers from the donor and partner agency.

The need to first identify what information intended users want evaluations to provide led to adoption of a phased approach to this research (Figure 1). Phase 1 identified what information the intended users of evaluation findings want evaluations of capacity development to provide and the characteristics they would require a framework to demonstrate to be useful (Chapter 4). Following this, Phase 2 determined whether application of a framework for evaluation of capacity development provided this information and demonstrated these characteristics. This phase adopted a case study approach to consider application of a framework to three initiatives (Chapter 5). The final phase consisted of cross-case analysis of the findings from these three initiatives (Chapter 6). Given the importance of clarity in understanding the identity of the intended users, the different groups of intended users and sampling strategy will now be discussed.

**Sampling strategy.**

The research strategy identified the importance of obtaining rich data to capture the variety of perspectives different stakeholders held of the same situation. In line with this, a purposeful sampling approach has been adopted throughout this research. With this sampling strategy, information rich cases were selected to provide the opportunity to maximise learning and, at the same time, select interviewees on the basis that their participation would enhance use of the research findings.

Criteria for selection were defined to ensure those sampled would be information rich and facilitate maximum use of findings. In terms of individuals interviewed for both Phases 1 and 2, this meant that they needed to be an intended user of the research’s findings. However, as Phases 1 and 2 had different information needs, the populations from which the sample of intended users was drawn for each phase are different. For Phase 1, the population is all
intended users. Whereas for Phase 2, the population is only those intended users who design, implement or use the M&E findings from the case studies as it is only these users who will have the information required about the application of the framework to the case study. Thus, the population for Phase 2 is a subset of that for Phase 1 (Figure 2).

As a consequence of the different information needs, this research adopted different sampling strategy and criteria for interviewees from within the intended user groups for each phase. Chapters 4 and 5 discuss these sampling strategies. The following section discusses the different groups of intended users.

Identification of potential Phase 2 case studies occurred in parallel with the implementation of Phase 1. The criteria for selecting the initiatives used in Phase 2 as case studies are described in Chapter 5.

Figure 2. Population from which sample is drawn for each phase.
The intended user groups.

As previously identified, this research is designed to maximise use of findings. Consequently, the focus is on meeting intended users’ needs and maximising their participation throughout all stages of the research. Thus, all data collected was from the intended users. Intended users are those who will be concerned about the outcome of this research and are likely to use the findings in future. Therefore, intended users comprise the donor, the partner (the agency in the host or recipient country) and those contracted to support implementation of the activity (Figure 3). This section describes briefly the population for each of these intended user groups from which the sample was drawn and limitations associated with their participation. Their role in relation to M&E is summarised in Figure 3.

Figure 3. Intended user groups showing internal and external relationships and the roles M&E responsibilities.

Intended users from the partner agency include the managers and those working directly with advisers (often termed counterparts). The initiative level partner was a government agency for each of the case studies. However, at an activity level, some of the case studies also developed
the capacity of non-government organisations in the same way as a public sector agency. This research has not differentiated between the types of partner.

Gaining participation from partner agency managers was difficult. In most cases, concerns raised by the partner agency in relation to their relationship with the donor or the amount of time they were required to invest in donor-required activities, meant that either the donor or the management of the initiative believed greater partner agency involvement in the research would be deleterious to the initiative. This was further compounded by the numerous demands on partner agency manager’s time. Consequently, interviews were of more limited duration and generally scheduled for either half or one hour. The involvement of partner agency representatives in this research was limited, particularly for Phase 2.

The donor is the organisation that provides the funds for capacity development. Each donor organisation has different policy, systems, procedures and culture. Each has different requirements to conduct research on initiatives they fund, and in some cases, to interview their staff. This high degree of variability determines that at a donor level only one donor would be considered due to practicalities of obtaining the required approvals.

Reflecting the importance of the utility of the research findings, the criteria for selecting the donor was to maximise use of findings. The researcher believed that this would be achieved by selecting the Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID) because Australian evaluators working in international development were most likely to work with this donor. Since completion of the fieldwork, AusAID has been merged into the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT). This has resulted in changes to roles, responsibility and terminology – each of which are still in a state of flux. The term AusAID will be used throughout this research, as this was the relevant organisation (and context) at the time data were collected and largely analysed.

Within AusAID, there were a number of positions involved in the design of M&E on initiatives or who use evaluation findings. Because of this, there were several positions critical in both providing data and maximising use of findings. These include field staff based in country (Activity Managers and their manager, the Counsellor, Performance and Quality Unit) and managers at head office in Canberra (Figure 3).

In most cases, AusAID contracts the support required to develop partner’s capacity through a company known as the managing contractor. The managing contractor would generally provide
a person to provide strategic direction (referred to as a Program Director), a Team Leader and the Advisers, along with the management support team which includes an internal M&E Adviser. While the Program Director is usually contracted by the managing contractor, in some cases (such as one of the case studies) they are contracted directly by AusAID.

Most AusAID funded programs would include both internal and external M&E. The internal M&E is generally supported by an M&E Adviser engaged through the managing contractor. This Adviser would usually facilitate the development of an M&E Plan, and in most cases, support its implementation (AusAID, 2013c). The external M&E is generally undertaken as a Mid-Term Review and an Independent Completion Review. The terms of reference for these reviews are developed by the donor, with input from the partner and managing contractor. They generally reflect the DAC Criteria (Blamey and Gorapava, 2008; Winter, Edwards & Triaswati, 2011).

**Promoting use.**

The research strategy includes a focus on adopting an approach that supports use. Consequently, this research encouraged intended user participation in all stages of the research. Such participation has been demonstrated to bring many benefits to research outcomes (Bonney et al, 2009; National Health and Medical Research Council, 2004; Patton, 2008; Shirk et al., 2012).

To achieve this, intended users were asked how they would like to be involved in the research. Most indicated that constraints on their time meant they did not have sufficient time to be involved in the analysis. Therefore their preferred approach was to be informed of, and provide comment on, findings that could then be considered by the researcher. This does not correspond well to the various models for public participation in scientific research. For example, it does not reflect any of the categories used by the Center for Advancement of Informal Science Education (2009) (contribute, collaborate and co-create) or the expanded categories of contract, contribute, collaborate, co-create and colleagues proposed by Shirk et al., (2012). However, intended users’ preferred position most closely corresponds to the level of “consult” in the IAP2 (2004) model for public participation. This is a relatively low level of participation on IAP2’s model – the second lowest. At this level, the intended users would:

- Be informed of findings. This was achieved through the extensive peer debrief process, summary sheets provided to all participants and workshops for a broader group of intended users.
• Provide feedback on the analysis. This was achieved through provision of feedback on the summary sheets and during workshops.

• Provide feedback on the conclusions. This was achieved through provision of feedback on the summary sheets and during workshops.

Clearly, the level of participation is not as high as suggested by various approaches to public participation in scientific research. However, this level reflected intended users’ preference.

Criteria for assessing the quality of qualitative research.

As discussed earlier in this chapter, this research will use qualitative data to obtain the richness required to gain an understanding of each intended user’s perspective. While the research strategy may evolve, the basis on which the quality of this research will be assessed must be unambiguous. However, options available for assessing the quality of research are almost unlimited.

Until the 1960s, the quality of qualitative research was generally judged by criteria for quantitative research (Cohen and Crabtree, 2008). At that point, a number of researchers (for example Cicourel, 1964; Garfinkel, 1967; and Schutz, 1962) started to argue that these criteria were not appropriate for assessing the quality of qualitative research. The basis for this position was that different paradigms and purposes underpin these forms of research and they each use different methodologies (Horsburgh 2003, Kitto et al., 2008). In general, it was agreed that the quality criteria for quantitative research are not appropriate for qualitative research and other criteria that better reflect the purpose, nature and conduct of qualitative research would be more appropriate (Kitto et al., 2008; Spencer et al., 2003). While this position is relatively well accepted today, it remains debated (Horsburgh 2003; Spencer et al., 2003) and no criteria have been universally agreed.

The options available to a researcher grew, and today are enormous. Northcote (2012) reported over 100 different sets of criteria, while others have reviewed smaller numbers of proposed criteria to produce their own. For example, in developing a new set of criteria, Cohen and Crabtree (2008) reviewed 35 sets of criteria, Finlay (2006) discussed some 10 sets of distinct criteria and Spencer (Spencer et al., 2003) reviewed some 30 sets of criteria. In addition, quality criteria have been proposed for specific qualitative methodologies; Tong et al., (2006) reviewed more than 22 sets of criteria for focus groups and interviews, General Accounting Office (GAO)
(1990) identified criteria specific to case study and Furlong and Oancea (2005) identified a number for applied and practice based research. Again, these authors generally undertook these reviews to develop and propose their own set of criteria.

Some, including most of these authors, proposed that it is possible to establish a set of criteria that can be used across all qualitative evaluations. This has led to a number of broad conceptual frameworks being proposed including the lists of criteria in Critical Appraisal Skills Programme [CASP] (2013), Kitto et al., (2008), Patton (2003), Spencer et al., (2003) and Tracey (2010). However, others raise concerns that this leads to use of criteria that are not appropriate to the study and suggest these ‘metacriteria’ become, by necessity, “too abstract for application in the evaluation of a particular study” (Stige et al., 2009, p. 1506).

This leads to a second set of authors who argue that the uniqueness of every qualitative evaluation necessitates assessing the quality of each piece of research against criteria that reflect the purpose and approach of that piece of research (Carter & Little, 2007; Finlay, 2006; Horsburgh, 2002; Northcote, 2012; Stige et al., 2009). In addition, there is a seemingly small group, including Schwandt (1996) and Smith (1984) who contend that it is not possible to apply quality criteria to qualitative research. This argument is generally based on the position that the philosophical foundation of qualitative evaluation means that there would be a logical inconsistency in trying to define quality criteria for qualitative research. This is reflected in Smith’s (1984, p. 389) statement that:

> Given the idea that social reality is mind-dependent, that facts cannot be separated from values, that the only point of view we have is that of various people based on various interests and purposes, and so on, it is impossible to be foundational or to ‘ground’ our findings in the sense of ‘getting it right.’ In this situation what is trustworthy or true is nothing more than what we can agree, at any given time and place, is trustworthy or true.

This position is generally refuted by the argument that without some form of assessment of quality, the value of qualitative research will be questioned and transferability of findings to policy and practice limited (Hammersley, 2007; Kitto, 2008). As a result, it is generally agreed that some form of quality criteria against which the quality of qualitative research can be assessed is required, however there remains a lack of agreement on what these criteria should be (Finlay, 2006; Spencer 2003).
Perhaps what comes out of this confusion is the necessity to ensure the criteria used to assess quality are “fit for purpose when it comes to research paradigm, the epistemological stance of the researcher and selection of the methodology” (Northcote, 2012, p. 99). Thus, the definition of fit for purpose is determined by the research strategy adopted.

In this case, having adopted an approach that supports utilisation, the criteria used to assess the quality of this research will focus on ensuring that the methodology and findings support use of the research findings. Therefore, for the findings to be used, they must be transferable and, we have assumed, also meet the relevant criteria intended users established for judging the utility of a framework for evaluating capacity development. These criteria, as set out in Chapter 4, are: utility and flexibility (in this context both reflect the transferability of findings) and robustness of the research-base. These also reflect the series of factors related to perceived rigour and ability to transfer the findings that Patton (2008) identified as affecting use of findings. The methodological approach this research adopted to support transferability of research findings and ensure a robust research-base are now discussed.

Methodology adopted to support transferability of findings.

There is much debate over the extent to which findings from qualitative, and in particular, case study research, are transferable or can be generalised. For example, Lincoln and Guba (1985) argue that findings from qualitative evaluations cannot be transferred or generalised, while Falk & Guenther (2007), GAO (1990), Mitchell (1983), and Popay et al., (1990) argue that they can. Yet others such as Stake (1980), argue that while generalisation is not an objective of qualitative evaluation, findings can be generalised in certain circumstances.

Some argue generalisation of findings is dependent upon case selection. For generalisation to be possible, case selection must reflect the purpose of the research (Falk & Guenther, 2007; GAO, 1990) and “produce the type of knowledge necessary to understand the structure and processes within which the individuals or situations are located” (Popay et al., 1998, p. 346). In line with this approach, as discussed earlier in this chapter, the sampling for this research was guided by the research question and led to adoption of a purposive sampling approach. Thus, both the interviewees (Phase 1 and 2) and the initiatives (Phase 2) were chosen based on the qualities they have that enhanced the research study. These qualities are discussed in Chapters 4 and 5.

To maximise transferability of the results from Phase 1, data was collected and analysed from the breadth of intended user groups. Each intended user group was then treated as a separate
case, with data analysed separately before cross-case analysis occurred. In Phase 2, the three cases have been selected to provide as diverse a contextual background as was practical and this context has been described in thick detail.

Others usually argue that generalisation is to theory rather than populations and dependent on the quality of the theoretical underpinning of the work (Byrman, 2012). This is well reflected by Mitchell (1983, p. 211):

In case study … the inferential process turns exclusively on the theoretically necessary linkages among the features in the case study. The validity of the extrapolation depends not on the typicality or representativeness of the case but upon the cogency of the theoretical reasoning. In terms of this argument, case studies may be used analytically—as against ethnographically—only if they are embedded in an appropriate theoretical framework. The rich detail which emerges from the intimate knowledge the analyst must acquire in a case study if it is well conducted, provides the optimum conditions for the acquisition of those illuminating insights which make formerly opaque connexions suddenly pellucid.

In line with this position, this research has developed a theory setting out the information users need and characteristics they require any useful framework for evaluation of capacity development to meet (Chapter 4). The Capacity Development Evaluation (CDE) Framework was then tested against this theory (Chapter 5). In addition, the reasons why the CDE Framework was found to support evaluation of capacity development were considered and are presented in Chapter 7. Each of these elements provides a theoretical basis on which the findings from this research can be transferred.

Falk & Guenther (2007, p. 8) identified that the ability to generalise the findings is also dependent on “the receiving audience’s perception”. To assess whether the intended users saw the findings as transferable, extensive peer review was undertaken. This included presenting the findings at Australasian Evaluation Conferences (Kotvojs and Hurworth, 2011 and 2012) and at four workshops consisting of participants from the intended user groups7. Transferability of findings was explicitly addressed with workshop participants. In each case, the audience and

participants considered the findings to be transferable. The findings were also published in a peer-reviewed journal (Kotvojs and Hurworth, 2013).

This research also assumed that if the findings were transferable, they should address many of the weaknesses with evaluations of international development, and more specifically evaluations of capacity development, that had been identified in the literature. As shown in Chapter 6, this was found to be the case.

In summary, to support transferability of findings, this research chose a purposive sampling approach enabling selection of interviewees and initiatives that would provide the most relevant data for the research and transferring findings to other initiatives. This is supported by describing the contextual background in detail and analysing the perspective of a breadth of intended user groups. Generalisation has also occurred to a theory that was considered through a peer debriefing process. This audience concluded that the findings were transferable. Through these mechanisms, the transferability of findings has been demonstrated as far as is possible.

**Methodology adopted to ensure trustworthy findings.**

Intended users identified that they would assess the utility of a framework for evaluation of capacity development by the extent to which they believed the framework was trustworthy through having a robust research base (Chapter 4). Reflecting this, the second quality criteria adopted for this research is trustworthy findings.

In seeking a robust research base, the intended users were expressing their need to have confidence in the findings. This concept is expressed in different terms in the literature. For example, trustworthiness was introduced by Lincoln and Guba (1985) and is still used by many (for example Furlong & Oancea, 2005); plausibility, credibility and relevance are used by Hammersley (1990); Guba and Lincoln (1994) also use the terms credibility, dependability and confirmability; Spencer et al., (2003) include rigour in conduct and credible in claim; Ballinger (2006) uses coherence, evidence of systematic and careful research conduct, convincing and relevant interpretation; Finlay (2006) uses clarity, credibility, contribution and communication resonance; and Cohen and Crabtree (2008) include validity, credibility, reliability and rigour.

Despite this variety in terminology, the methodological approaches proposed to achieve these concepts are relatively consistent. Methods proposed by these authors include triangulation of data, member checks, peer debriefing, maintaining a chain of evidence, independent audits and
prolonged engagement in the field. These mechanisms have each been integrated into both Phase 1 and 2 of this research design. The approach to incorporation of these mechanisms into this research is now discussed.

In Phase 1 and Phase 2 of this research, triangulation of data was achieved through the depth of information collected, combined with the large number of intended users interviewed from different intended user groups and contexts. Semi-structured interviews using open-ended questions (Appendix B) provided a depth of information. Language was often a challenge, not only for those for whom English was a second language (in two cases a translator was used to provide greater comfort to the interviewee), but also for many advisers who had limited knowledge of terminology related to either capacity development or evaluation. Consequently, it was often necessary to rephrase questions, or explain terms with which they were not familiar. The use of semi-structured interviews enabled this clarification to occur and provided detailed information on the person’s experience and their interpretation of this experience, and the opportunity to gain a deeper understanding of their response during the interview. Comparison of responses of those from different user groups, working on different programs, in different countries and with diverse backgrounds enabled triangulation.

For Phase 1, triangulation was also facilitated by seeking additional sampling selections outside the target group to maximise variation and, through this, trustworthiness of the results. On Phase 2, triangulation of data was supported by interviewing a number of people from each intended user group for each case study several times over a lengthy period; analysing data from interviews, reports and emails; and cross-case analysis of three case studies.

Thorough member checking of all collected data was conducted (Table 1). Interviews were undertaken face-to-face, by telephone or Skype, depending on the location of the interviewee. Initially interviews were digitally recorded. However as this made a number of interviewees uncomfortable, subsequent interviews were documented by hand. Copies of interview transcripts were emailed to each interviewee to check for rigour and edit in any way that the interviewee wanted, including deleting material they were not comfortable to make public, clarifying material or adding further information. All edits were incorporated before the data was analysed. The results from each workshop were distributed to those attending that workshop and a summary of findings from these workshops provided to all those who had expressed interest. A draft copy of the case study was emailed to each person interviewed for
that case study to check for rigour. Comment was sought on the findings, whether there was anything the interview disagreed with, wanted to add or clarify. In addition, a two-page summary of the findings from each stage of analysis was provided to every person interviewed as part of the member checking process.

Table 1. Use of member checking and peer review to support robust research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>To whom</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interview record</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Interviewee</td>
<td>Member checking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop summary</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>Workshop participants (over 80)</td>
<td>Member checking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two page summary of preliminary findings (five stages)</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>All interviewees (50 - 70 people)</td>
<td>Member checking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Others interested (total 12 people)</td>
<td>Peer debrief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Workshop participants (20 – 80 people)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agencies who have developed a framework to evaluate capacity development (four)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft case study</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Interviewees for that case study (12 - 20 per case study)</td>
<td>Member checking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Case Analysis</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>All interviewees (70 people)</td>
<td>Member checking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Others interested (total 12 people)</td>
<td>Peer debrief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Workshop participants (some 80 people)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agencies who have developed a framework to evaluate capacity development (four)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key evaluation questions &amp; criteria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Workshop participants (some 80 people)</td>
<td>Peer debrief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions in relation to two case studies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M&amp;E specialists at AusAID facilitated workshop (30 participants)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As part of the peer debriefing process, this two-page summary was provided to other intended users who had expressed interest in the research and the relevant section within each of the agencies that have developed a framework for evaluation of capacity development (ECDPM, UNDP and World Bank). This sought comments to assist in ensuring that the findings reflected
their experience of the data. Peer debriefing was also conducted through presentation of the findings at Australasian International Evaluation Conferences (Kotvojs and Hurworth, 2011 and 2012) and conducting a series of workshops for AusAID, managing contractors and evaluators. In addition, data was collected from all participants in the workshops on the information they would expect an evaluation of capacity development to provide and the characteristics a framework would need to demonstrate to be useful. Workshop participants then compared this to the conclusions of Phase 1. The only difference found was that participants from New Zealand included cultural appropriateness as a criterion. Unfortunately, it was not practicable to conduct workshops or specifically engage partners in this phase (other than through the presentations at Conferences). As shown in Table 1, this approach provided extensive peer debrief.

The chain of evidence established underpins dependability. Complete electronic records have been maintained. Each person interviewed has been given a unique identifier that has been used to reference all quotes. The identifier is designed to maintain confidentiality of the individual while providing a clear audit trail. Documents were also given a unique identifier.

Data were managed in HyperResearch. While this proved useful given the volume of data collected, HyperReseach had several limitations. When it was selected for use, the data for inclusion was expected to be Word documents. However, as data collection occurred, documents in PDF and Excel format were also collected. These could not be included effectively into HyperReseach. Other strategies involving summarising and cross-referencing critical elements were implemented to address this. HyperResearch also had limitations in relation to case naming. For example, if there was a case called “LN3”, HyperReseach would not display a case name that was a subset of this existing name such as “L”, “N”, “LN”, “N3”. The supplier of HyperReseach did not respond to several enquiries concerning this limitation.

In both phases, data analysis was conducted in parallel with data collection. This involved reading the data several times and then coding the data. The researcher then identified patterns, similarities and differences within and across user groups. As a result of undertaking initial analysis in parallel with data collection, there was an overlap between several codes. These codes were consolidated into broader categories before the final analysis occurred. In Phase 2, coding occurred against intended users’ information needs and the characteristics they

---

8 The unique reference identifies the stakeholder group from which the interviewee is drawn and the number of interviews conducted with that person to that date. The references have been maintained as endnotes and are included in Appendix H.
required a framework to demonstrate (determined from Phase 1) and the issues that emerged during initial Phase 2 data analysis. Cases were developed, explanation building and cross-case analysis undertaken (Yin, 2009).

To enable “the reader to determine whether the analytical comments, or claims, made by the researcher appear to be justifiable” (Horsburgh, 2005, p. 309) the chain of evidence was audited by a highly experienced researcher and evaluator (Patton, 2003, p. 1 and 2; Spencer et. al. 2003, p. 157). Having audited 17 interviews and more than 150 references, she concluded that “the interviewee references in the text that I have checked are true and accurate.” (A. Lockley, personal communication, 14 December 2014). The auditor specifically investigated whether she would have drawn similar conclusions from the data. She concluded that “the thesis accurately captured the views expressed in the interviews.”. The audit findings are attached (Appendix C).

Many authors have identified that prolonged engagement in the field will support establishing thick descriptions and rigour in the evaluation (Lincoln and Guba, 1985; Spencer et al., 2003; Stige et al., 2009). This research achieved prolonged engagement through repeated interviews of those participating in the Phase 2 case studies for periods of up to three years. Between interviews, contact was maintained with each of the case studies to maximise development of contextual sensitivity.

There is a tendency for researchers to look for evidence to confirm their preconceptions and biases (Patton, 2008). This is known as confirmation bias. To address this, as part of the analysis and feedback process, the M&E Adviser and team members from two of the three case studies presented their own experience at the workshop for M&E specialists and at the workshop for managing contractor staff. The workshop participants used this information to draw conclusions regarding the application of the Framework. The member checking and peer debriefing processes also sought to minimise the potential for confirmation bias.

In summary, this research collected data through prolonged engagement in the field. The analysis adopted an approach that included extensive triangulation of data, member checks and peer debriefs. A rigorous chain of evidence was maintained and audited. Through these mechanisms, the trustworthiness of findings has been established.
Ethical consideration

AusAID approval was required to interview AusAID staff and use initiatives funded by AusAID as case studies. Obtaining this approval was a lengthy process, taking almost 18 months. The initial difficulty was finding a champion for the research within AusAID, in particular someone who would convince managers that the research would not result in adverse publicity. The final challenge was to obtain approval from the University of Melbourne regarding a number of clauses AusAID required in the 22-page research contract established between the University of Melbourne and AusAID. Once this formal agreement was obtained, it was then the individual AusAID manager or staff member’s decision as to whether they participated and whether they allowed initiatives for which they were responsible to be included. At this level, there was generally widespread support.

Contractually, regular updates on the research were to be provided to AusAID. However, AusAID did not provide feedback on updates, nor accept offers of verbal updates for the first three years of this research. This may have been a consequence of the frequent changes of staff in the relevant central areas and a number of restructures during the research. These changes resulted in the champion for the research being lost and the research not having an institutional owner. While those initially involved remained interested in the findings, other commitments meant that they were not able to prioritise meetings for verbal presentations. Those who replaced the original institutional owner indicated that they would prefer a short written report on findings and to discuss any matters they wanted to investigate further. While the findings were reported, no further dialogue occurred.

During the life of this research, for approximately six-months there was a greater interest in findings. AusAID facilitated a workshop with relevant AusAID (now DFAT) staff and provided feedback on all reports and drafts submitted. This was a consequence of changes in AusAID staffing. However, when this person took leave, the interest again waned.

At a case study level, the relevant manager from each of the partner agency, AusAID and the managing contractor provided consent to use each initiative as a case study. The partner agencies and managing contractors involved were each keen to be involved in research they anticipated would contribute to improvement in evaluation of capacity development. Each managing contractor and partner agency was advised that the name of the initiative would be kept confidential if they requested. However, none requested this occur.
For both Phase 1 and Phase 2, at an individual level, the research was explained to each person interviewed, along with how the data collected from them would be used, how to withdraw their interview and the process for raising any concerns. This was also provided in a written format that the interviewee signed to indicate consent (Appendix D). Only two people subsequently withdrew consent to use their interviews, both for Phase 1 and both at the direction of AusAID in Solomon Islands.

All individuals were advised that the research would endeavour to keep their identity confidential. This was undertaken by keeping all data in securely locked cabinets and a password-protected computer. The name and contact details of those interviewed were kept in a separate password protected file to the data they provided and only available to the researcher and auditor. All interviewees were advised that while they would not be identified in this thesis, given the small size of the sector it was possible that some people may guess their identity. Prior to finalisation of this thesis, a copy of the case study draft was sent to each person whom it was possible to identify to determine whether they would like greater anonymity, or any statement revised or removed. While making minor edits, each of these interviewees confirmed that they were happy with the draft and did not want increased anonymity. In several cases, they stated that to do so would reduce the value of the research.

Following this, a copy of the draft case study was provided to each person interviewed for that case study. Each interviewee was provided with the opportunity to comment before the case study was distributed further. A copy was also provided to AusAID, the partner agency and each managing contractor for their comment before finalisation.

THE ROLE AND INFLUENCE OF THE RESEARCHER

Recognising that truth can be seen as subjective (Carson et al., 2001; Lincoln and Guba, 1986; Ozanne and Hudson, 1989) and that in Phase 2 the research was testing the CDE Framework, a framework developed by the researcher, this research adopted a range of strategies to minimize the influence of the researcher on the conclusions. These strategies included rigorous member checking of data recorded and findings from analysis to confirm that the data collected did reflect the interviewee’s position (Table 1), extensive peer debrief of findings as each phase of analysis was completed (Table 1), and consideration of alternative explanations to account for the findings (Chapter 6). In addition, an external audit of data and conclusions was undertaken (Appendix C). As noted previously, the auditor concluded that “the thesis accurately captured
the views expressed in the interviews”. (A. Lockley, personal communication, 14 December 2014). The auditor specifically investigated whether she would have drawn similar conclusions from the data. The audit findings are attached (Appendix C).

The researcher was also the M&E Adviser on one of the three case studies used (the Australia Indonesia Partnership Economic Development Facility). While a small number of those interviewed would have been considered more ‘junior’ to the M&E Adviser, it is unlikely that significant power dynamics were present given that none of those interviewed reported to the M&E Adviser, each was experienced in presenting their positions to senior managers, those most central to this research had experience in presenting contentious positions to others, and most were senior to the M&E Adviser. To minimise further the influence of the researcher, she did not include any of her own experiences in the data for analysis. In addition, on completion of the analysis for this case study, all those interviewed (including advisers, and initiative, partner agency and AusAID managers) were asked to review the case study and advise if they thought that the researcher had “been less than objective in [the] analysis because of [her] role”. None considered that this had occurred. Similarly, the Program Director (the most senior position) reviewed the full thesis and did not have any concerns with the objectivity of the analysis or conclusions. He specifically stated that “The section on AIPEG is nicely done and picks up the nuances between the varying views of those who were ‘subjected’ to the framework. The analysis is balanced too.” (M. Halse, personal communication, 15 December 2014).

LIMITATIONS

The limitations of this research primarily relate to the boundaries established for the research question. In addition, there are limitations resulting from the sampling frame adopted.

The research question specifically addressed the Framework for supporting evaluation of capacity development. As such, it did not assess the quality of the M&E Plans developed or the M&E undertaken, other than as perceived by the users. For example, the research did not determine the rigour of data collection and analysis on a specific initiative. Rather it considered whether users perceived that the use of the Framework assisted them to plan and implement an evaluation of capacity development. Therefore, the findings do not make an independent judgement about the quality of the M&E undertaken on the case studies, the research accepts the perspective of users in relation to quality and changes in quality as a result of application of the CDE Framework.
This research tested one framework; the one available at the time the research commenced. The research did not compare the various other frameworks now available. However, this research does identify why the Framework was, or was not, useful in the evaluation of capacity development so that these factors can be used to test the utility of other frameworks.

For Phase 2, the sample of case studies analysed were all funded by AusAID within the international development context. The reasons for this choice are discussed in Chapter 5. In addition, the CDE Framework was applied to the three case studies for internal evaluation rather than external evaluation. Thus, all discussion and findings for Phase 2 relate to internal evaluation of capacity development initiatives funded by AusAID in an international context.

As discussed earlier, the number of intended users from partner agencies who could be interviewed for Phase 2 was limited. Consequently, their perspective has not been captured to the extent desired, particularly for the case studies in Indonesia. If their experience was significantly different to that of other intended users, this may not have been well captured.

**SUMMARY OF THE RESEARCH DESIGN**

This research is designed to determine whether the application of one of the available frameworks assists the evaluation of capacity development initiatives. As each stakeholder may perceive the value of a framework differently, this research has adopted an interpretivist approach using qualitative methods to obtain the rich data required. To avoid the narrow perspective inherent in the DAC Criteria consequent on their development being undertaken solely by donors, care has been taken to identify and include representatives from all intended user groups. Reflecting the role of the intended user in determining the value of the framework, the criteria used to assess the quality of this research were those identified by intended users: the robustness of the research and transferability of the research findings. A range of methods have been adopted to enable these quality criteria to be met.

Ultimately, the utility of a framework to evaluate capacity development is dependent upon the information intended users require being provided when the framework is applied. Consequently, this research is designed to first identify the information intended users expect such an evaluation to provide and the characteristics they require a useful framework to demonstrate. The following chapter (Chapter 4) sets out these findings. A case study approach has then been applied in Phase 2 to determine whether information needs and characteristics
are met when a framework for evaluation of capacity development is applied in three different contexts. The Phase 2 research design and findings are presented in Chapter 5.
Phase 1

I want it to be able to tell me the situation at the start, what the program hoped to achieve - the aspirations, what was achieved, how they believed the intervention helped to achieve this, what external factors have influenced this outcome, what could be done better. The lessons learned around each of these are really important. For example if you did not achieve what you wanted to due to external factors, how could you address this in future designs to overcome the problem?
CHAPTER 4. PHASE 1: WHAT CRITERIA DO INTENDED USERS HAVE FOR A FRAMEWORK TO EVALUATE CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES?

INTRODUCTION

The first stage (Phase 1) in determining whether “the application of one of the CDE Framework assists the evaluation of capacity development initiatives” was to identify intended users needs. There were two elements of user needs: the information users require the evaluation to produce and the characteristics desired in a framework. Following identification of these needs, the second stage (Phase 2) of this research determined whether application of the CDE Framework met users’ needs.

This chapter addresses Phase 1 of the research. The chapter expands on the methodology presented in Chapter 3 to set out details specific to this research phase. The Phase 1 research findings identify users’ information needs and the characteristics they require a framework to demonstrate. These findings are significant in their own right as this appears to be the first time that users’ needs for capacity development evaluations have been identified and documented. They are presented and then used in Phase 2 as the rubric against which this research judges the utility of a framework to evaluate capacity development.

RESEARCH DESIGN FOR PHASE 1

The design for this research was discussed in Chapter 3. This section presents elements of the research design unique to the approach used in Phase 1. These focus on the specific sampling approach, data collection and analysis, and peer review process.

As maximising use of findings was an underpinning principle for this research, the sampling approach for Phase 1 was designed to support use. Consequently, interviewees were selected on the basis that their participation would enhance use of the research findings. Therefore, the criteria for selection of participants were that they:

• Are intended users of the findings, ensuring that the findings reflect their perspective.

• Have experience in capacity development initiatives. This could be in a design, implementation, evaluation or management role.

• Have experience in international development.

• Have experience working on AusAID (now DFAT) initiatives.
A combination of stratified purposeful, snowball and maximum variation sampling approaches were adopted for this phase (Bryman, 2012). This involved initially interviewing participants from each intended user group who were involved in the potential Phase 2 case studies. Following this, others who met the criteria and were identified by participants or known to the researcher were interviewed. In addition, AusAID managers identified staff in Canberra and at two in-country offices who met the criteria for interview. Using a stratified sampling ensured that there were adequate people in each of the intended user groups to enable comparison of these groups.

Throughout this process, maximum variation was sought by ensuring that intended users from a wide range of settings were interviewed. This included intended users working on different initiatives, in different countries (Australia, Solomon Islands and Indonesia), with diverse backgrounds (including community development, health, education, governance, justice, fisheries and agriculture sectors) and with a wide range of levels of M&E expertise. This also resulted in inclusion of three people from each of New Zealand International Aid and Development Agency (NZAID, since becoming part of the New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade), International Non-Government Organisations (INGO) and multilateral agencies. These nine people did not have experience on AusAID initiatives, however were specifically included to support triangulation.

Interviews were continued for each user group until achievement of theoretical saturation, a concept originally developed for grounded theory but more broadly applicable (Strauss and Corbin, 1998). In this case, theoretical saturation was achieved when interviews did not elicit new themes or aspects of a previously identified theme. As a result, most interviews for Phase 1 were conducted between November 2010 and May 2011. Where participants were more difficult to engage (particularly those from the partner agency), there was a need to conduct additional interviews to achieve theoretical saturation. In all cases, this was completed by June 2012.

Over this period a total of 65 people gave consent to be interviewed. Subsequently, two participants working in Solomon Islands (one AusAID and, at AusAID’s direction, one Adviser) withdrew approval to use their data and so this data was not included in the analysis. As a number of interviewees fell into more than one user group category, their material has been analysed in each (Table 2).
Table 2. Number of people interviewed from each intended user group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>User Group</th>
<th>Managing contractor</th>
<th>Team Leader</th>
<th>Adviser</th>
<th>M&amp;E role</th>
<th>Partner Agency</th>
<th>Multilateral donors</th>
<th>International Non-Government Organisation (INGO)</th>
<th>NZAID</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AusAID (Canberra)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AusAID (Indonesia)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AusAID (Solomon Islands)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During Phase 1 interviews, many intended users indicated that due to time constraints they would prefer that the researcher analysed the data and presented the findings for their consideration. As a consequence, the analysis for Phase 1 was undertaken by the researcher and feedback provided to all those interviewed and other interested parties. Comment was sought and the limited comment received was integrated. The findings were also communicated to intended users through a series of conference papers and workshops targeting the broader population of intended users rather than only those involved in the research.

INTENDED USERS UTILITY CRITERIA FOR A FRAMEWORK TO EVALUATE CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES

Data were coded (refer Appendix E for a sample) and analysed to determine the criteria each intended user group would apply to judge the utility of the framework. These criteria covered two broad areas: information intended users wanted evaluations to provide and the characteristics of the framework. In both cases, there was a great deal of variability in interviewee’s responses, both between and within each user group. However, a relatively small number of criteria covered most of the areas raised with less than 10% of any user group raising one of the remaining responses. In addition, these remaining responses were not identified by intended users who participated in the peer review workshops. Consequently, only the commonly raised eight information needs and seven characteristics were considered in Phase 2 of this research.

Cross-case analysis between user groups was then undertaken using these eight information needs and seven characteristics. To avoid repetition, the cross-case analysis is summarised in the table at the start of each section, and then integrated into the findings. The small numbers of people included as part of the maximum variation sampling are not shown in the tables. Where their position was significantly different to that of other user groups this is presented in the findings.
The following section presents the findings from the qualitative analysis of interviews. This is presented in two sections: 1) the information intended users want evaluations of capacity development initiatives to provide, and 2) the characteristics they required in a framework.

The information intended users want evaluations of capacity development to provide.

Analysis of data from interviews found only one common area where most of those interviewed (and most of each user group) required information. This was “What changes have happened as a result of the support?” Beyond this, there was less consistency in information required between user groups (Table 3). For example, while a further three information areas were of interest to almost half of those interviewed: “How have these changes occurred?”, “What lessons have been learned? ” and “Has progress toward or achievement of objectives occurred?”, they were not of interest to all the groups, and the need for the information and focus of information required varied between user groups.

Table 3. Information needs of primary interest to different user groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Need</th>
<th>Donor (Canberra)</th>
<th>Donor (Post)</th>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Managing contractor</th>
<th>Advisers</th>
<th>Responsible for M&amp;E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What were the changes?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How did the changes occur?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What lessons were learned?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What progress has been made toward sustainable achievement of the objective?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend

The primary importance to user group
Identified by at least 50% user group
Identified by at least 25% user group

A discussion of each of these four information needs follows. Within each section, the results are presented by user group in order of priority users groups placed on the
evaluation of capacity development providing this information. Each section concludes with a summary across all user groups.

**What were the changes?**

Of most interest to all user groups interviewed were any changes that resulted from the initiative. This included planned or unplanned changes in the knowledge, skills and behaviour of individuals; the organisation; and in a small number of cases, service delivery and consequently the ultimate beneficiaries. While identification of observable change was a common requirement, there were significant differences between the focus of each user group (Table 4).

**Table 4. Information needs of primary interest to different user groups in relation to the changes that had occurred.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Need</th>
<th>Donor (Canberra)</th>
<th>Donor (Post)</th>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Managing contractor</th>
<th>Advisers</th>
<th>Responsible for M&amp;E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a. What changes occurred in individual’s motivation and confidence?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b. What changes occurred in individual’s knowledge and skills?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. What changes occurred in individual’s behaviour?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d. What changes occurred in the organisation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1e. What changes occurred in services delivered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1f. What was the contribution of the initiative to these changes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**

Identified by at least 50% users

Identified by at least 25% users

Identification of change was a particular priority for partners and nationals. This is reflected in all counterparts and, with one exception, nationals specifying provision of information on change as a key requirement of capacity development evaluations. Partners primarily wanted the evaluation to provide information on changes in the organisation as a result of
capacity development activities. For example, “I want to see that there has been an improvement in my institution and the way that [for example] staff implement a loan agreement with donors. This is hard as each loan agreement is different”. In general, the changes at both the organisational and individual level were described as resulting from training. This focus probably reflects the general perception across those partners interviewed that capacity development and training are synonymous. The focus on behavioural and organisational change is reflected in the typical comment from a partner:

I would want the evaluation to show that what he has done is benefiting his work and the Ministry and the country as a whole. What has been achieved from the training opportunity that he or she is going through.

While AusAID managers were also particularly interested in the evaluation identifying change, there were significant differences in the information requirements of those in Canberra and those at Post. Those based in Canberra were most interested in receiving information from the evaluation on changes in high level outcomes - service delivery and resolution of the problems that the initiative was designed to address. However, this was not raised by AusAID managers at Post. In contrast, those at Post frequently identified the need for information on contribution or attribution whereas those based in Canberra raised this less frequently. As one manager explained, while “we should look at the high level outcomes, but to attribute what we have provided to achievement of high level outcomes is fictitious. All our development logic is trying to make this link”. Perhaps the greater recognition of the challenge of both attribution and contribution at Post accounts for their focus on information on organisational and behavioural change rather than service delivery.

As with partner agencies, AusAID managers indicated a need for information on application of knowledge and skills gained and behavioural change (including leadership) rather than simply whether the knowledge and skills of those trained had increased. Despite this interest, some AusAID managers noted that they effectively ask the wrong question, they tend to ask whether “‘Ministry X is capacitated to Y’. We often say they are ‘able to do’, rather than ‘they do’.

Only one AusAID manager, with previous experience as an adviser and evaluator, identified that the perspective taken in relation to change should be from the perspective of the beneficiary, rather than the donor. He pointed out that this difference in perspective can have important implications for the way change is perceived:
... as an outsider looking at something that appears to be a very small change, it may actually be a very significant change for the people in that context. ... How we judge the value of the outcome needs to be from the perspective of the beneficiary.

The focus of **M&E advisers** was on the evaluation providing information on changes in an individual’s behaviour and the organisation. They more frequently articulated the need for evaluations to identify changes in the organisation resulting from the initiative than other intended user groups. This focus is reflected in one evaluator’s statement that on all evaluations “I look for things that the institution can do now that it couldn’t do before the assistance.”

The example given by another evaluator captures this well:

The key question for me is what do you do differently now in comparison to what you did before because of the program. . . . This also refers to different systems and values being in place and applied that were not there before. For example, for a government’s program there may be new regulations in place which lead to new units being put in place to address the issues, or the individual in the units producing things differently. If there has been an increase in planning and budget capacity, then you would look to see whether allocations have improved, they are more realistic, or whether there are other changes in line with what you expect.

M&E Advisers were also interested in information on changes in counterpart and partner agency motivation and confidence. They considered this was often a deficiency in the findings of many evaluations.

Similarly, **team leaders and advisers** often expressed the need for information on changes in motivation and confidence. This was a consequence of their perception that motivation and confidence were critical in transforming knowledge and skills to changes in behaviour, the second area of information on change they required. This is reflected in the statement by a team leader that:

I’d want to know if there was demonstrable change ... Under that there are a lot of little elements, like whether staff performance and motivation has increased, whether the new procedures and systems are in place and being used. But overarching it all is whether there has been demonstrable change and therefore if the organisation is operating at the level we want.

This desire for information on behavioural change was also held by **Program Directors and managing contractor representatives**. However, for them, this information was primarily
required to help inform these managers about changes at a higher level. This is reflected in
the statement by a managing contractor representative that:

You often find the report says ‘capacity of the individual has been developed’, it may
present some evidence. But there is rarely an analysis of what has happened at the
organisational level or in terms of service delivery. I am really interested in looking at
the whole chain\textsuperscript{xviii}.

A small number of Program Directors and managing contractor also indicated that they
would like a framework for evaluation of capacity development to “give some attention to
attribution or contribution”\textsuperscript{xx}. However, some questioned whether this was the role of a
framework\textsuperscript{xx}.

Interviewees from international non government organisation’s (INGO) were selected to
support triangulation through maximising diversity. Their information needs were similar to
those of advisers. Their focus was on identifying behavioural change to identify whether
there had been changes in confidence and motivation. This was because they considered
confidence as a key step in the capacity development theory of change\textsuperscript{xxi}.

However, the focus of those interviewed from New Zealand International Aid and
Development Agency (NZAID), another group selected to maximise diversity, was somewhat
different. They generally considered that information on improvement in the ability of the
beneficiary to address their own problems was key\textsuperscript{xxii}. This is interesting because, despite
AusAID’s definition of capacity development, including the phrase “self generating
performance improvement”, the ability of an individual or organisation to deal with their
own problems was only identified by one of those interviewed from AusAID. As this person
pointed out:

What evaluation of capacity building should be asking is the extent to which we are
contributing to (for example) Papua New Guinea’s ability to solve their own problems.
If they can’t, then we haven’t contributed to building capacity.\textsuperscript{xxiii}

A small number of AusAID managers based in Canberra, Program Directors and Advisers
indicated the importance of measuring unplanned change\textsuperscript{xxiv}. For AusAID mangers, there was
a focus on negative unintended change to enable improved design of future initiatives. For
Program Directors and Advisers, capture of significant positive change was also critical as
indicated in the following statement by a Program Director:
Sometimes the unforeseen outcomes or more important than the planned outcomes. For example building a girls’ school in Pakistan increased the number of girls at the school, but the real impact was on a society where coeducation was banned and parents started sending the boys to a girls’ school because the girls were happier than the boys (they were less cruel, more responsive to the child’s needs) and it had a significant impact there\textsuperscript{xv}.

Overall, intended users expressed the need for a framework for evaluation of capacity development to identify demonstrated, planned change in an individuals’ motivation, confidence, knowledge, skills and behaviour; and the organisation. Consistently the information required was on changes in performance rather than simply changes in ability. To a lesser extent, intended users also wanted contribution and unintended change to be identified.

**How the change occurred**

After identifying what changes had occurred, the information intended users most frequently required related to how the change occurred. This included the effectiveness of the particular capacity development strategies being implemented and the impact of external factors (known as environmental factors) on the outcomes (Table 5).

**Table 5. Information needs of primary interest to different user groups in relation to how change occurred.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Need</th>
<th>Donor (Canberra)</th>
<th>Donor (Post)</th>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Managing contractor &amp; Team Leader</th>
<th>Advisers</th>
<th>Responsible for M&amp;E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2a. Was the capacity development strategy effective?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. What factors in the environment influenced the change?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**

- Identified by at least 50% users
- Identified by at least 25% users

**Donors** (including AusAID, NZAID, and INGO’s) were all particularly interested in identifying whether or not the capacity development strategies worked\textsuperscript{xvi}. A typical comment from AusAID managers was “I want evaluation of capacity development to tell me what works and
what doesn’t, this is important in a practical way”xxvii. One AusAID manager identified that the effectiveness of the strategies should be considered from the partners’ perspective rather than the donor’sxxviii. However, this was not identified by others.

Many of the AusAID managers interviewed identified how they use information on the effectiveness of capacity development strategies. For example, “I ... want to know ... what changed for the participants, why did it change, and what else was going on in the environment. If you have this information, you can form a judgement”xxix. In all cases, the information was to be used to determine “whether we are using the right approach to capacity development”xxx and change the strategy to improve the existing or future initiativesxxxi.

AusAID managers, particularly those at Post, also wanted evaluations of capacity development to identify the factors in the environment that had already influenced achievement of the outcomexxxii. Many AusAID managers based in the partner country also wanted the evaluation of capacity development to identify changes in environment that may affect future implementation of the initiativexxxiii. This is reflected in the following statement by an AusAID manager based at Post:

Another thing I want to know is if there is any change of context, so that we would need to adjust the approach for any future program. So apart from evaluating the success of past program, we could use the input to guide our future directionxxxiv.

AusAID managers planned to use this information to address these factors in future initiatives rather than the current initiative.

Advisers were also extremely interested in information about how the change occurred. Adviser’s interest was focussed on the effectiveness of different capacity development strategiesxxxv. They primarily wanted this information to improve implementation of the existing initiative, however many also planned to apply the learning to future initiatives:

Understanding why or why not change occurred is just as important. Learning about the capacity development process itself in a particular context in which you are working and what does or doesn’t work is important. Using [specific capacity development strategies] ... don’t work in all contexts. So we really need to understand what works before you start, then test and revise it, and test it again. Otherwise, you face the potential of making the same mistakes over and over again.xxxvi
Relatively few Advisers identified the need for evaluations of capacity development to identify the impact of the enabling environment. For those who did, the information required remained closely related to the strategies being considered. For example, one Adviser wanted the evaluation to answer; “Could we have used a different process to meet the things that were constraints - such as cultural mores?”

This contrasted with evaluators, many of whom required information on both how the change occurred and the impact of external factors on the initiative. This information was required to improve both the current and future initiatives. As one evaluator stated:

“I want to know what model of capacity development is being applied? Why is it suitable? ... and then have] a good account of the context. In this day and age we shouldn’t have to say this but we still do, you need to consider the gender, power relations, ethnicity, past experience of working with capacity development and donors, and how this influences what people are able to do and how they can make use of the resources provided. You need to provide information around key contextual issues that influence capacity development.”

Partners rarely required information on why the change occurred. This information was only required by one partner agency manager, he intended to use it to enable remedial action to be undertaken where a strategy was proving effective.

Overall intended users generally want evaluations of capacity development to provide information on the effectiveness of particular capacity development strategies being implemented, the impact of external factors (known as environmental factors) on progress and outcomes to date, and changes that may affect future implementation of the initiative. Regardless of which user group they represented, those who had extensive experience in evaluation of capacity development were more likely to require this information than were those who had relatively little experience in this area. Intended users planned to apply this information to generate lessons that, as discussed in the next section, could be applied to the existing initiative or future initiatives.

**What lessons were learned.**

Closely related to the demand for a framework to provide information on how the change occurred was the need to identify lessons learned. Overall, this was the third most frequently cited area of information required from evaluation of capacity development. There were two aspects to this learning; the first was to inform implementation of the
existing initiative and the second was to inform future initiatives (Table 6). Different user groups had a different focus on each of these two areas.

**Table 6. Information needs of primary interest to different user groups in relation to lessons learned.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Need</th>
<th>Donor (Canberra)</th>
<th>Donor (Post)</th>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Managing contractor &amp; Program Team Leader &amp; Advisers</th>
<th>Responsible for M&amp;E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3a. What lessons were learned for application to this initiative?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. What lessons were learned for application to other initiatives?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**

- Identified by at least 50% users
- Identified by at least 25% users

The majority of Advisers were interested in information that could be applied to improve the initiative on which they were engaged. Comments typical of advisers were “[I want to know] which aspects of the program worked well, which didn’t, how can they be strengthened, how can they be done better”\(^xli\). Advisers did not identify a need to for information on lessons for application to other projects.

Those directly involved in the management of initiatives (Program Directors and Team Leaders) were also more interested in lessons that could inform the initiative being evaluated rather than other initiatives. Where Team Leaders wanted evaluations to inform other activities, this was generally not a primary need. For example, one suggested that; “An added bonus would be that [the framework] gives me takeaways that I can apply to other programs”\(^xlii\).

Evaluators also expressed the need for evaluations of capacity development to identify lessons learned. As with advisers, their interest on application of lessons to the current initiative: “The evaluation needs to be able to make suggestions to improve the program”\(^xliii\).

Few evaluators expressed a need for a framework to support identification of lessons that could be applied to future initiatives.

This was in contrast to donors. Donors were most interested in lessons that could be applied to other initiatives with both AusAID (particularly those based in Canberra) and NZAID managers\(^xliv\) expressing the importance that “the evaluation help inform future
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programming”. An AusAID manager stated that for a framework to be useful it would need to “help in the thinking about the lessons learned, specifically so that you can ... say this is what we could do differently in future”. The focus of AusAID managers based in Canberra on application to future initiatives rather than the existing initiative may be a consequence of their focus on external rather than internal evaluations. This is reflected in an AusAID manager’s statement:

The midterm review and independent performance reviews [external reviews] are places we also do some forward thinking. These are appropriate points during the program for you to look at performance as it should be and what you would do to improve it if you want to continue investment to the next phase.

Few partners identified the need for evaluations of capacity development to identify lessons. Where this was identified, it was clearly linked to future directions:

I also want to see the next step, looking to the future. I don’t think that one program will solve the problem as it is dynamic, so I want to see the next step and the recommendations. This is very important if I am in charge of the organisation. So I want to see the possible actions that we can take to improve things.

Overall, intended users expressed the need for evaluations of capacity development to provide information on what has been learned that could be applied to improve this and future initiatives.

**What progress has been made toward sustainable achievement of the objective?**

There was a strong demand among those interviewed for evaluations of capacity development to provide information on progress toward, and achievement of, the objective. However, there was a great deal of variation in this requirement between user groups (Table 7).

For partners, information on achievement of the objective was a critical information need; the only area they consistently identified other than information on the changes that had occurred. The information they required related to achievement of the originally agreed objectives - there was no suggestion that the objective may change during the life of the initiative. For example:

An evaluation is always based on what the objectives of the program were. This is the only way to measure success, look at what the achievements were. Otherwise, it is outside the program objective and is subjective.
Table 7. Information needs of primary interest to different user groups in relation to achievement of sustainable objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Need</th>
<th>Donor (Canberra)</th>
<th>Donor (Post)</th>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Managing contractor &amp; Program Team</th>
<th>Leaders &amp; Responsible for M&amp;E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4a. Has the objective been achieved?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b. What progress has been made?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c. Are the outcomes sustainable?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**

- Identified by at least 50% users
- Identified by at least 25% users

In addition, the focus of partners was on attainment of, rather than progress towards, the objective. None of the partners interviewed indicated that they wanted evaluations to provide information on progress towards the achievement of the objective. A small number of partners also indicated the need for information on sustainability. However, this tended to be on whether the inputs could be sustained.

**Managing contractor representatives and Program Directors** frequently emphasised the need for information on achievement of objective. They also wanted information on progress towards objective and sustainability of outcomes. In general, all of this information was required to enable them to identify areas where objectives were not going to be achieved and revise the initiative accordingly. Among this group there was a general recognition that the achievement of change takes time and therefore it is often important to identify any progress towards change rather than just assessing the degree of change at the end. Reflecting this, a Program Director explained that they:

> ...would want some demonstration of progressive improvements in capacity. I say progressive as capacity development is inherently over a long period of time, it is incremental, it is building on one stage before moving to the next.

**AusAID managers** in Canberra and at Post both identified that they needed information on progress towards achievement of the objective and its ultimate achievement. They also identified the need for information on sustainability of the outcome and the factors that may influence this sustainability. For example, “If, for example, your objective is the implementation of functionality of an organisation, then has it achieved this, how can you
tell it is achieved, and what will look like in 10 years’ time?\textsuperscript{lvii} This information was often required for accountability purposes and to enable AusAID staff to provide information for briefings when required.\textsuperscript{lviii} However, as expressed by an evaluator from AusAID:

> I think accountability would be the rhetoric, but as we don’t look at the quality of capacity development, I’d argue the extent to which it was rhetoric or reality.\textsuperscript{lviii}

**Team leaders and advisers** had a relatively low level of interest in achievement of the objective and were more interested in sustainability of outcomes and to a lesser extent progress toward objectives. In most cases, the interest in this information was to identify areas where objectives were unlikely to be achieved and modify the support required to address this.\textsuperscript{lix}

Few **M&E Advisers** specified information related to achievement of the objective as a requirement. For those who did, it was information on progress toward the objective and sustainability.

While a number of those interviewed raised the need for information on sustainability, few were specific as to what they referred. Where this was stated, the sustainability information intended users wanted varied. For most, their focus was on sustainability of outcomes – none of those interviewed referred to sustainability of benefit.\textsuperscript{lx} However, others had a different focus. For example, a senior partner agency manager indicated his focus was on information in relation to “whether the input by the project can be sustained” while an AusAID manager, the focus was on what would influence the sustainability of outcomes.\textsuperscript{lxii} This reflects an interest in the specific aspect of sustainability that is of most relevance from that user group’s perspective.

Overall, intended user groups indicated that evaluations of capacity development should provide information on progress toward, and sustainable achievement of, the objective – generally a focus on the original objective.

**Other information needs.**

A number of other areas were identified by users as information needs. However, in each case these were identified by less than 10% of any user group. The most common of these related to testing the theory of change. Other information needs identified included “What opportunities had been missed?”, “Were the inputs of high quality?” and “What was the extent of partner ownership of the initiative?”. However, each of these questions was only identified by a small number of people (at most three).
Those who sought information on the theory of change were mainly AusAID staff (primarily at the Indonesia Post) and those involved in evaluation of the initiative\textsuperscript{lxiv}. For some, the focus was a concern about the robustness of the links between outcome levels\textsuperscript{lxv}. For others it was whether changes at an individual level were transferring to groups and being embraced at the organisational level\textsuperscript{lxvi}. In these cases, the intent was to move the focus of the evaluation questions away from the lower levels (inputs and outputs, or individual) to higher levels (outcomes or organisational change).

Given the small number of people who identified these issues, they were not included as a criteria for assessing the utility of a framework for evaluation of capacity development.

**Discussion of findings.**

The purpose of this component of Phase 1 research was to identify the information intended users wanted evaluations of capacity development initiatives to provide. This research found that while information needs were wide ranging, several common themes accounted for the majority of information needs across all user groups. The variations between user groups in importance of each of these information needs were related to the user’s role in international development. However, regardless of these variations, the information needs intended users identified were not well aligned with the DAC Criteria.

**Variability between user group.**

The research findings suggest that there was a great deal of variability in the information needs of different user groups. Both local context and role were significant determinants of users information needs.

The significance of local context was suggested by the differences in information needs between managers at different AusAID posts. For example, capacity development initiatives in the Solomon Islands are being implemented in a Post-conflict situation. There, AusAID staff could see little progress in capacity development and many considered that seeking to develop capacity was premature. This may explain why AusAID managers in Solomon Islands were mainly interested in what changes were occurring and why these changes did or did not occur. This was in contrast to AusAID managers working in Indonesia where programs are larger, partner agencies better resourced and AusAID staff have been part of a program to develop their own capacity in M&E. In Indonesia, the AusAID staff interviewed were more interested in the evaluation identifying lessons that could be generalised and applied to other capacity development initiatives than was the case in Solomon Islands.
The information needs of AusAID staff at the Post were generally narrower than that for those based in Canberra. Similarly, Advisers’ information needs were generally narrower than Program Directors or managing contractors. The emerging pattern was that the closer a person was to initiative implementation, the narrower their information needs. During the peer review workshops, a participant suggested that this may be because those close to implementation are already aware of much of this information (for example, advisers are generally cognisant of progress) and this awareness decreases with distance. Consequently, the need for information increases with distance.

Similarly, those more directly involved in the initiative were more focussed on change in areas they considered critical to successful capacity development. For example, improving motivation and confidence have been demonstrated as critical early steps in capacity development (DANIDA, 2010; ECDPM, 2006; Land & Dobunaba, 2009). As this is recognised by many of those working on initiatives, they expressed a strong need for information on changes in motivation and confidence. This information demand was found to decrease with distance from the initiative. Thus, while advisers and team leaders frequently identified this, it was less frequently identified by Program Directors and even less frequently identified by Australian based managing contractor representatives. This same pattern was demonstrated between AusAID managers based at Post and in Canberra.

Broadly, the questions different intended user groups want answered reflect their role, and consequently the different ways in which they will use the evaluation findings. In summary, there are those who:

- Need to focus on accountability (Partners, managing contractors and Program Directors, AusAID at Canberra). Their focus is on whether the objective has been achieved. These intended user groups also occasionally identified cost efficiency. This information needs to be provided regularly throughout the life of the initiative.

- Want to improve future capacity development initiatives (mainly AusAID). Their focus is on what influences the change (both the effectiveness of different capacity development strategies and factors in the environment) so that lessons learned can be applied to other initiatives. This information needs to be provided at discreet points in the life of the initiative.

- Want, primarily, to use the findings to improve the implementation of the existing initiative (mainly Advisers). In terms of changes, their interest is on change at the lower levels of the theory of change (motivation, confidence and behaviour) as evidence that
the strategies are effective and progress towards the outcomes occurring. More broadly, their focus is on learning which strategies are not leading to change so that they can apply lessons learned to improve outcomes. This information needs to be provided on an almost continual basis throughout the life of the initiative.

Thus, end users of the information have different evaluation requirements in terms of both information needs and frequency with which this information is provided. This reflects the findings of an OECD-DAC Working Group in relation to selection of indicators:

Different management levels tend to place emphasis on different indicator types. For example, project field staff will find input and process indicators of most use, whereas project managers will be more interested in achievement of project outputs and outcomes. Senior agency officials will be interested in the longer-term and broader social and economic impacts of the project, which may not be evident until after the project is completed. These different intended uses and users need to be kept in mind when selecting indicators. (OECD-DAC, 2001, p. 6)

Unfortunately, the findings of this working group have not been reflected in the OECD-DAC Criteria.

Comparison with DAC Criteria.

As discussed in the Literature Review (Chapter 2), the DAC Criteria are the most widely used basis for evaluation questions in international development. Ideally, these criteria should reflect the information needs of intended users. However, this research did not find a high degree of alignment between the information needs of intended users and the DAC Criteria. This is summarised at the end of this section in Table 8.

Across the intended users interviewed for this research there were four areas that captured the information needs of most of those interviewed regardless of the intended user group. The first of these was “what has changed as a result of the initiative?” This corresponds to the DAC Criteria “what is the program’s impact”. However, there are some important differences between these two questions. Those interviewed were focused on changes across all levels, not just high-level changes as suggested by the DAC Criteria. In addition, the focus of the DAC question is on long-term effects. However, across those interviewed for this research there was no suggestion that changes in the short-term were not to be considered.
Those interviewed for this research generally wanted the evaluation to identify whether application of the capacity development strategy was effective. This is not identified by the DAC Criteria. The failure of the DAC Criteria to include specific consideration of the effectiveness of capacity development strategies is possibly a consequence of the criteria being developed before capacity development became a focus of development assistance initiatives and no major update having since occurred.

Intended users interviewed were also interested in the impact of environmental factors on the initiative. This was not explicitly stated in any of the DAC documentation reviewed, other than the clarification on the DAC website. The website expanded the question in relation to the program’s effectiveness and sustainability to include consideration of the factors that influenced achievement or non-achievement of the objective and sustainability of the benefits. This would capture the information that those interviewed for this research required in this area. Perhaps the only difference is that those interviewed were also interested in the changes in context that could influence the future direction. This may be captured under the DAC Criteria that considers the relevance of the program.

Those interviewed as part of this research specifically wanted evaluation of capacity development to identify the lessons that could be applied to this or other initiatives. While the DAC Criteria does not specifically include these, OECD-DAC (1991, p. 5) clearly states that one purpose of evaluation is “to improve future aid policy, programmes and projects through feedback of lessons learned”. This addresses lessons to improve future initiatives, but not the current initiative. The focus of the DAC Criteria is thus on learning that has a more strategic focus than was the focus of those interviewed.

Both of the DAC Criteria and those interviewed included a question focused on progress toward or achievement of the objective. The only difference in focus was that the DAC Criteria provided a directive to take into account the relative importance of the different objectives. This was not raised by those interviewed.

Sustainability is also identified by both the DAC Criteria and those interviewed. However, the focus of information required is quite different. For those interviewed, the focus was on whether the outcomes (generally seen as improved organizational performance) could be continued. This contrasted the broader consideration of continuation of long-term benefits by the DAC (OECD-DAC, 2002) and the tendency for these to focus on benefits that will be achieved within five to ten years and include improvements in service delivery (AusAID, 2000). Thus, the DAC Criteria in relation to sustainability, focused on sustainability of higher-
level benefits often achieved in the longer term than was the general interest of those interviewed.

While the DAC Criteria included consideration of program efficiency, this was rarely raised by those interviewed. When raised, the emphasis tended to be on whether the capacity development strategy was the most cost effective approach to achieve the results and also a recognition of the difficulties associated in measuring and comparing efficiency of initiatives. Of those who did identify efficiency, there was a belief that it may not be possible to produce a meaningful, quantitative result to measure efficiency of capacity development at the initiative level\textsuperscript{lxvii}. This perceived difficulty may account for why many of those interviewed did not seek information in this area.

The DAC Criteria also included consideration of the initiative’s relevance. This was rarely identified by those interviewed and there was no consistent pattern across the three people who mentioned it. One considered relevance of the technical content, another relevance of adopting a capacity development approach and the third, the continued relevance of outcomes\textsuperscript{lxvii}. However, a number requested information on contextual changes that could influence the initiative’s future direction. This would encompass consideration of the ongoing relevance of activities and outcomes.

In summary, there are significant differences between the questions specified in the DAC Criteria and those intended users identified in this research. In broad terms, the DAC Criteria include a greater focus on change at a higher level and longer term than was generally the interest of those interviewed. Those interviewed primarily wanted the evaluation to provide information they could apply immediately to initiatives being implemented or designed. There was relatively little interest in findings that were of a more strategic nature or application in the longer-term.

These differences may reflect the difference between those who developed the DAC Criteria and those interviewed for this research. Development of the DAC Criteria was led by the heads of evaluations units from almost all bilateral and multilateral agencies at that time (Chianca, 2008a). In contrast, those interviewed for this research encompassed the broad spectrum of users including: partners, advisers, those managing initiatives, AusAID managers from the activity to Counsellor level and members of AusAID’s evaluation units (Chapter 3). The differences in these two groups are significant; in particular, partners were not members of the DAC, nor were ‘on the ground’ implementers.
The lack of alignment between user’s information needs and the DAC Criteria is likely to influence adversely use of evaluation findings. In addition, this disjunct could be expected to lead to a general dissatisfaction with capacity development evaluations. This will be discussed further in Chapter 7.

**Conclusion.**

While there is variation in the information that intended users require evaluations of capacity development to provide, there are four areas that encompass most of these information requirements. These areas differ significantly from those identified in the OECD-DAC Criteria (Chapter 4). As discussed, this difference is possibly due to the DAC criteria having been developed solely by donors, whereas this research identified criteria required across all intended users. Consequently, the criteria identified by this research will form the rubric against which a framework for evaluation of capacity development will be assessed (Chapter 5). These information needs are:

1. What changed?
2. How the change occurred?
3. What lessons have been learned for application to this and other programs?
4. Has the objective been achieved and if not, What progress has been made toward sustainable achievement of the objective?
### Table 8. Comparison of users information needs and those specified in the DAC Criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings from this Research</th>
<th>OECD DAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information users require</td>
<td>Definition (Based on OECD- DAC, 2002 &amp; 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What has changed?</strong></td>
<td>Demonstration of planned change in individual’s knowledge, skills and behaviour and the organisation. To a lesser extent, contribution and unintended change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What progress has been made toward sustainable achievement of the objective?</strong></td>
<td>Has the original objective been achieved and if not, what progress has been made toward its achievement? Can the improvements in organisational performance be continued?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process</strong></td>
<td><strong>What is the initiatives sustainability?</strong> Have the initiative’s benefits continued after major development assistance has been completed. The probability of continued long-term benefits. The resilience to risk of the net benefit flows over time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What is the impact of environmental factors on the initiative?</strong></td>
<td>The impact environmental factors had on progress and achievement of outcomes. Changes in the context which could influence the future</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Application of the CDE Framework to the Evaluation of Capacity Development Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings from this Research</th>
<th>OECD DAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What lessons have been learned for application to this initiative?</td>
<td>Lessons that can be applied to improve this and future initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What lessons have been learned for application to other initiatives?</td>
<td>While not included as a criteria, a purpose of evaluation is stated as “to improve future aid policy, initiatives and projects through feedback of lessons learned” (OECD, DAC, 1991, p. 5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the capacity development strategy effective?</td>
<td>Was the capacity development strategy effective?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the initiative's efficiency?</td>
<td>How economically were the resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) converted to results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The DAC website expands this to include whether the objectives were achieved on time and the initiative implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the initiatives relevance?</td>
<td>Are the initiative’s results still relevant to the needs of the target population, the partner country’s national development priorities, and to the donor agency’s corporate goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The DAC website expands this to include consideration of the extent to which the objectives of the initiative are still valid, the initiative’s activities and outputs consistent with goal, impacts, effects and attainment of its objectives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Characteristics of a useful framework.

The second area investigated was the characteristics intended users require in a framework for it to be useful in supporting the evaluation of capacity development. The findings are discussed in this section.

Analysis of data from interviews found that there was only one characteristic of a framework to support evaluation of capacity development common across user groups; this was that the framework was easy to understand. Beyond this, there was significant variation between user groups (Table 9). There were a further three criteria that were important to most intended user groups: the ease of implementation of the framework; and rigour in both the framework and in the findings produced. As shown in Table 9, there were several other criteria that a large number of people saw as important: versatility of the framework, use and usability of findings and that the resource requirements were realistic. The requirements of users in relation to these characteristics are presented below.

Table 9. Characteristics intended users require in a framework to support evaluation of capacity development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>User Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Donor (Canberra)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to understand</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to implement</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports rigorous evaluations</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Versatility</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use and usability of findings</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic resource requirements</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend

The primary importance to user group
At least 50% of user group identified
At least 25% of user group identified
Easy to understand.

The importance of conceptual simplicity was the requirement most frequently identified by all intended user groups for a framework to be useful in evaluation of capacity development\textsuperscript{lxix}. Users felt that many existing frameworks and concepts in the development sector (including evaluation) were too complex. This is reflected by numerous respondents, particularly from partner agencies and those working directly on projects, making statements such as “it can’t be scary, most frameworks and models in the development sector scare people”\textsuperscript{lxxx}. That conceptual clarity of the framework is equally important to many at AusAID is reflected well in the comment: “If you have the most beautiful M&E System but it is not easy to understand, it won’t be useful to the program or to the partner”\textsuperscript{lxix}. This emphasis on the ability of all stakeholders to understand the framework was common\textsuperscript{lxxii}.

However, there was also a perception in the sector that models are of high quality only if they are complex. This was manifest in statements such as:

Sometimes AusAID sees that sophistication equals complexity. They don’t see that sophisticated can still be simple.\textsuperscript{lxxiii}

The intended users stated that a useful framework would express all concepts in clear language\textsuperscript{lxiv}. They suggested that complexity was often added unnecessarily to the language used in M&E as indicted in “I find the jargon one of our biggest shortcomings and I work in development”\textsuperscript{lxxv}. In this case, intended users believed that M&E experts had introduced the complexity\textsuperscript{lxxvi}. The complexity of both the M&E and the findings was perceived by some AusAID managers to adversely impact upon use of findings. One commented that because of this, simplicity was critical so that they could make judgements easily about the recommendations and products of the M&E consultants\textsuperscript{lxxvii}.

Several donors requested simplicity of language and concept to enable the framework to be translated into other languages\textsuperscript{lxxviii}. From their perspective, translation would be simplified if the framework were simple in terms of both language and cultural concepts\textsuperscript{lxxix}.

Thus, intended users consistently identified that a framework to support evaluation of capacity development must be easy to understand. This requires simplicity of language, concepts and presentation.
Ease of use.

Ease of use was a key criterion, particularly for activity implementers, evaluation advisers and AusAID staff in Indonesia. This requires that evaluation expertise is not necessary for the M&E and that the framework can be integrated into the initiative.

Those interviewed emphasised ease of use by those involved in the activity, partners, the implementers and the AusAID staff, rather than ease of use for evaluation experts. In some cases, this was for the added benefits resulting from ease of use. For example, one evaluation expert explained that creating a framework that could be used with partner agencies might enable future replication by partner agencies. Other comments typical of AusAID managers were: “It needs to be something that a regular AusAID person can use. We are not evaluation specialists” and “Can a general development person pick it up and use it?” As one adviser noted, without this, the quality of the evaluation will be affected adversely.

The requirement that input from an evaluation expert not be required to apply the framework was not universally held. For example, another AusAID manager, who was also an evaluation expert, held a counter position. This manager said that:

I don’t think that the framework needs to be accessible, useful for everybody to apply. If it did this, it would lose its rigour. It needs to be replicable by trained practitioners. I’d be happier with a framework that required people to have some training before they can apply it.

His position reflects the dominant current practice where most evaluations of donor-funded activities are implemented by an external, specialist evaluation team.

The balance between over simplicity and ease of use was recognised by all user groups. This challenge is reflected in the following experience:

Evaluation of capacity development is basically a pretty difficult thing to do. Patricia Lyon’s model was flawed or not complete, but it was easy to apply. It was a good starting point for us. I compare it to some of the things that [named another evaluation approach] has done, and they are almost impossible to understand, they were highly theoretical and rarely worked in implementation.
Ultimately, it was identified that the framework “has to be something that strikes a balance between trying to understand the complexity and telling a simple story”\textsuperscript{xlvii}. For many advisers and AusAID managers, the ease of use of a framework meant the M&E could be fully integrated “within the process of the initiative that it was designed to evaluate”\textsuperscript{xlviii} rather than “tacked on”\textsuperscript{xlix}. Where this is either not possible or not implemented from the start, complexities are introduced as reflected in an AusAID manager’s statement: “... if the program wasn’t setup at the start to be measured, the retrofitting does my head in a bit”\textsuperscript{xc}.

A broad spectrum of reasons were given for integration of evaluation into the design and planning of activities. These included that it: enabled M&E to occur as a continuous process rather than only when the specialist adviser was present, maximises the use of partner agency data and helps ensure the findings of the evaluations are fed back into the partner agency and program planning process\textsuperscript{xci}. Thus, for a framework to be useful to the intended users, the framework must be easy to use. This requires that it adopt a practical rather than theoretical approach to implementation that does not require ongoing M&E expertise to implement and can be integrated into initiative implementation rather than forming a separate function.

\textit{Resource requirements.}

The level of resources required to apply an M&E System based on a particular framework were also considered to contribute to the frameworks utility. In general, intended users required that development and implementation of an M&E System based on the framework did not require significant levels of human and financial resources and data. However, there was a variety of perceptions.

The level of human resource requirements were only raised as a criterion by AusAID staff in Indonesia. To be useful, they suggested that the framework should not “need lots of bodies”\textsuperscript{xcii}. For some, the balance between the number of people implementing the initiative and the number involved in evaluation was important. They expressed a concern that evaluation of capacity development may become the objective of the initiative rather than a tool to support initiative implementation. In this situation they indicated that implementation of an evaluation framework may be excessive in relation to the time spent ‘doing’ the work\textsuperscript{xcii}. For others the
focus was on ensuring the requirements for partner agency staff commitments to M&E were minimal.\textsuperscript{xciv}

However, partner agency managers were less concerned about the time M&E required provided that it was beneficial to the organisation. As an Indonesian senior executive interviewed (who recognises the value of evaluation) said: “The amount of time or resources needed wouldn’t stop me using [the framework] if it is good for the Ministry. If it is good for the Ministry it has to be done.”\textsuperscript{xcv} A similar statement typified the position of many advisers: “I am willing to put in a lot of time if I think it will be useful, but if there are diminishing marginal returns, then I am less inclined to put time into it.”\textsuperscript{xcvi} From these responses, it appears that what is important is whether those involved in the evaluation believe that the benefits outweigh the costs in terms of time and other resources.

Partners also indicated that a framework needed to provide value for money, rather than minimise the absolute cost. However, AusAID managers and evaluators tended to focus more on the absolute cost of planning and implementing evaluations using the framework. They noted that this cost needed to be relatively low\textsuperscript{xcvii} and believed that this was important to both partners and AusAID.

Two AusAID officers from the Indonesian post identified realistic data requirements as a characteristic of a useful framework for evaluation of capacity development. They noted that in the Indonesian environment there were significant constraints in terms of availability and quality of data. Consequently they concluded that if the framework “is highly reliant on lots of data, it isn’t useful”\textsuperscript{xcviii}.

Thus, for a framework for evaluation of capacity development to be useful, its resource requirements must be realistic. This means they should provide value for investment – both investment of time and money – and ideally, not have a significant requirement for human and financial resources. The requirements for data should also be limited, but most importantly, realistic.

\textit{Use and usability.}

Most intended user groups identified the importance of the framework’s ability to support the use of findings and that it produces results that could be applied. This parallels the concepts of usability (“the extent to which the design of an evaluation – both its output and the way it is
undertaken – maximizes, facilitates or disables its potential use”) and use (“the way in which the outputs of an evaluation may or may not be used in an organizational setting or policy context as a resource for onward practice, policy or decision making”) (Saunders, 2012, p. 422).

In terms of use, the intended users identified a variety of ways in which evaluation findings would be used. The three uses specifically identified were to support planning and decision-making, communication with stakeholders and improvement of the current initiative. Many user groups identified the need to provide partner agencies with information that would support their decision making and planning processes\textsuperscript{xcix}. However, these information needs were not raised by partner agencies. Donors also identified that the evaluation of capacity development should produce findings that they could use to support future program planning\textsuperscript{c}.

A number of AusAID managers and evaluators identified use of the evaluation findings to support stakeholder communication throughout the program life cycle\textsuperscript{ci}; some felt this would help manage expectations\textsuperscript{cii}. For this to be effective, those interviewed suggested that the framework must be able to clarify what the initiative is doing and present evaluation findings succinctly. Among some, there was a belief that use of findings would be maximised where the evaluation framework supports “producing some really good reports\textsuperscript{ciii} which tell a clear story and provide succinct conclusions\textsuperscript{civ}.

Only a small number of those interviewed identified that implementation of the framework must meet the information needs of the program\textsuperscript{cv}, with a few specifically identifying the use of the findings by the initiative itself. For this to be possible, the findings needed to be provided in a timely manner\textsuperscript{cvi}.

A small number of staff from donors focussed on usability. They identified that:

People really struggle with how to use information [from evaluation]. So to be able to put it in a usable, practical way that people can use would be really helpful. People still struggle with the practical application of what comes out of evaluations, the translation of the theory into something operational\textsuperscript{cvii}.

Therefore, a few also desired that the framework provided guidance on how to use the findings and more broadly, is designed in such a way as to maximise use of findings\textsuperscript{cviii}.

Thus, intended users required a framework for evaluation of capacity development to be designed to support use of findings and provide information that can be used. Broadly this
meant that the evaluations needed to provide information in a timely manner that can contribute to partner agency planning and decision-making, donors program planning; implementers improve this initiative and communicate the initiative and findings with stakeholders.

**Rigour.**

A lower priority characteristic was that the framework was robust. This covered a range of aspects including that a rigorous approach had been used to design and test the framework and that use of the framework supported rigour in M&E implementation and the findings.

To establish a framework that was designed with rigour, several AusAID staff identified that the framework should be designed through a research based approach by people with appropriate expertise. The resulting framework would need to be able to “stand up in a community of evaluation [when] we put on a scientific and academic hat.” When the framework was applied, the results obtained must be repeatable. As part of this, the framework should have been tested, a practice recognised as rarely occurring at present:

> I would not want to give it to people to use unless I knew that it was useful and that it had been tested. This is a problem at AusAID, we often just send off things and say it is a good example.

In addition, it was desired that the framework facilitate implementation of evaluations that had rigour. However, recognising the realities of resource constraints, this was to be with “just enough data and analysis to make a good decision.”

For most stakeholder groups, the framework needed to ensure integrity of the evaluation’s findings so that these findings could form a basis for sound decision-making. The evidence used to draw conclusions needed to be credible and the findings honest. Without this rigour, it was agreed that the evaluation would be compromised.

For many there was a sense that rigour implies quantitative evaluation. However, several AusAID staff and evaluators identified that the framework need not promote quantitative evaluation. While it was useful to enable comparison between programs, they felt there was often an excessive focus on quantitative indicators. They held this position because of their experience that in a development context “indicators are often unreliable for reasons that can’t
be foreseen when the indicators were selected\textsuperscript{cxviii} and it was “more important to get the concept right”\textsuperscript{cxix}.

Thus, a useful framework should support implementation of rigorous, but not excessive, evaluations that produce honest findings. While quantitative analysis was often desired, this was not a consistent element of this criterion.

\textit{Versatility.}

Versatility was identified as a key characteristic of a framework for evaluation of capacity development by managers from both AusAID and the managing contractor. A few suggested that the need for versatility meant that no single framework for evaluation of capacity development would be possible.

For AusAID in Canberra, versatility was the most frequently identified characteristic desired in a framework that was useful for evaluation of capacity development. The perspective of many donors, particularly those at AusAID head office is captured in the statement:

[The framework’s] utility is key; the extent to which it can be applied elsewhere; it can have broader applicability; can you take in across all of your programs?\textsuperscript{cxx}

To be useful, the framework needs to be applicable to a range of different initiatives. This includes initiatives of different sizes, and those in different sectors\textsuperscript{cxxi}, at different levels (regional, national, institutional, organisational, community)\textsuperscript{cxxii}, with different partner agencies\textsuperscript{cxxiii} and in different cultural contexts\textsuperscript{cxxiv}. The framework must also be applicable to the program at different stages in the program life, not just on completion\textsuperscript{cxxv}. The framework also needs to recognise the variations between initiatives. At one level, implementation of the ‘same’ activity in two different locations will vary. For example, the resources required and time taken to achieve outcomes will be different\textsuperscript{cxxvi}. At another level, the framework needed to provide sufficient flexibility to adapt to the variety of approaches different implementers were likely to have\textsuperscript{cxxvii}.

While many expressed the position that a useful framework would be versatile, others indicated that the need for versatility meant no framework could be useful\textsuperscript{cxxviii}. They were concerned that extensive differences between capacity development initiatives may not be recognised if a single framework was used:
... people are trying to achieve different things with capacity building in different places. If you don't take these differences into account, then there is a danger that capacity building may become homogenous rather than broad ranging which is what it should be.\textsuperscript{cxix}

Consequently, rather than a fixed framework, several people believed that a principles based approach would be more effective\textsuperscript{cxxx}. Because of this, it was suggested it was better to engage a competent evaluator rather than draw on a framework: “I am quite strong on a laize-faire approach about how to approach M&E as you end up with a much better product if you engage with the right person and the right way”\textsuperscript{cxxxii}. While this was in part a consequence of some of those interviewed concern with the ability of a framework to provide the needed flexibility, there was also apprehension that a framework may become: “… a list of instructions that people follow without thinking. ... I think that if frameworks feed into the current trend for ‘give me a list’, this is not a positive thing”\textsuperscript{cxxxii}.

Thus, a framework for evaluation of capacity development needs to provide sufficient versatility to be applicable at different levels of a system; in different sectors and cultures; for different size agencies and initiatives; for initiatives using a variety of implementation strategy and at different stages in their life-cycle; and enable a variety of M&E methodologies.

\textit{Other.}

There were a range of other characteristics identified by a small number of intended users. In each case, less than 10\% of those interviewed identified these characteristics and they were not consistently identified by a particular user group. These criteria included that the framework:

- Support a participatory approach to M&E.
- Capture incremental development of capacity at output and outcome levels.
- Adopt a systems rather than linear approach.
- Establish realistic time frames.
- Incorporate monitoring of risk.
- Provide for a baseline.
- Build M&E capacity.
Given the relatively small proportion of intended users who identified each of these characteristics, they have not been considered as criterion for assessing the utility of a framework for evaluation of capacity development.

**Discussion of findings.**

The preceding analysis identified the intended users’ requirements for a framework to evaluate capacity development initiatives. These characteristics may be expected to reflect those established by DAC (OECD-DAC, 1991). However, while the characteristics specified by intended users interviewed for this research encompass all of the DAC Principles, their focus was subtly different. In addition, intended users identified an additional four characteristics that were outside the Principles established by the DAC.

The characteristics intended users require of a framework fell into two broad areas: those focused on the framework’s design and those on its implementation. The two criteria relating to implementation (rigour, and use of findings) encompass three of the four DAC Principles (credibility, impartiality and independence, and usefulness). The remaining DAC Principle that encompasses participation of donors and recipients was not frequently identified by those interviewed as a characteristic of a framework for evaluation of capacity development. This may be because those interviewed did not prioritise participation, or because they considered it a function of the specific methodologies used, rather than a framework itself. The latter is suggested by the number of those interviewed who identified use of methodologies enabling user participation and ownership as critical for the success of implementing M&E and use of findings. This is captured in the statement by a manager that: “You can’t work in isolation, M&E will only be effective if its users own and believe in it.” Interestingly, donors identified the importance of partner ownership and participation while partners identified donors ownership and participation. Neither identified the importance of their own participation.

Overall, there was a high degree of congruence between the characteristics users identified and these DAC Principles (Table 10). The exception was that this research found that user groups did not prioritise participation as a characteristic of the framework, and where raised, they generally identified the importance of another user group’s participation and ownership rather than their own. This contrasted the DAC Principles, developed by donors, which specified donors and recipients – and no other intended user groups.
Table 10. Comparison of criteria users want evaluations of capacity development to meet with the DAC Principles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Users Criteria</th>
<th>Findings from this Research</th>
<th>OECD DAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigour</td>
<td>Supports implementation of rigorous, but not excessive, evaluations with honest findings. While quantitative analysis was often desired, this was not a consistent element of this criterion.</td>
<td>Credibility: Using evaluators with credibility and relevant expertise and a transparent evaluation process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use and usability</td>
<td>Findings support use and are provided in a timely manner. Findings can be used to support the partner agency in planning and decision-making; the donor in program planning and implementation of other activities; and communication with stakeholders; and also meet the information needs of the program.</td>
<td>Credibility: Using evaluators with credibility and relevant expertise and a transparent evaluation process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to understand</td>
<td>Simplicity of language, concepts and presentation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to use</td>
<td>Practical rather than theoretical in implementation. Integrated into activity implementation rather than a separate function. Does not require M&amp;E expertise to implement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impartiality and independence: The evaluation should be impartial and independent of policy making, the delivery and management of development assistance.

Usefulness: Evaluations must be perceived as relevant and useful and be presented in a clear and concise way.

Participation of donors and recipients: Donors and recipients should be involved in the evaluation process.
### Application of the CDE Framework to the Evaluation of Capacity Development Initiatives

#### Findings from this Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Realistic Resource Requirements</th>
<th>Requirement for human and financial resources are not significant and the benefits outweigh the resource costs. Ideally, limited requirement for data.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Versatility</td>
<td>Applicable at different levels of a system; in different sectors and cultures; for different sized agencies; for initiatives of different size, implementation strategy and stage in project lifecycle; enable a variety of M&amp;E methodologies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OECD DAC</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


Neither the DAC Principles nor Evaluation Standards capture the four additional design related requirements intended users specified for a framework: easy to understand and use, realistic resource requirements and versatility. This is surprising given that the DAC Principles were originally designed to focus “on the management and institutional set up of evaluation systems” (OECD-DAC, 2010, p. 6). However, the actual focus of the DAC Principles is on implementation of the evaluation as would be demonstrated in the final evaluation report while the Standard “inform[s] evaluation processes and products” (OECD-DAC, 2010, p. 6).

The additional requirements intended users identified were that the framework was easy to understand and use, versatile and had realistic resource requirements. The first three elements are critical if the approach is to be participatory; a complex M&E system will exclude those with lower levels of M&E knowledge or insufficient time to become familiar with the M&E system. Given that all those interviewed indicated that the demands on their time were great and few were allocated dedicated time to focus on M&E, they did not have sufficient spare time to become familiar with a complex system. Thus, having a system that was simple to understand and apply, and could be applied in a diversity of contexts became more critical for maximising participation in M&E.

While the DAC Evaluation Standards consider resource provision, the focus is different to that of intended users. The intended users required that the resource requirements were realistic and the benefits outweighed the cost of M&E resources. This contrasts the DAC Standards that consider provision of adequate resources to meet the needs of the evaluation (OECD-DAC, 2010). The requirement related to resources as articulated by intended users is related to the design of the system whereas those in the DAC Standards reflect implementation.

This research found that intended users identified a broader range of requirements for an M&E framework than is identified by the DAC Principles. The additional criteria relate to the design of the framework, or M&E System, and emphasise ensuring that the team is able to implement the evaluation as designed. These requirements could not be considered to be specific to M&E of capacity development initiatives. These characteristics may have broader application than evaluation of capacity development, however, this is beyond the boundaries of this research.
Conclusion.

Across all intended users, there was a high level of consistency in the characteristics they would require a framework for evaluation of capacity development initiatives to reflect. While the DAC Principles formed an element of these characteristics, intended users’ needs were broader. Consequently, the characteristics specified by intended users’ form the rubric against which a framework for evaluation of capacity development will be assessed (Chapter 5). These characteristics are that the framework:

- Is easy to understand.
- Is easy to use.
- Supports a rigorous approach to M&E.
- Supports use and usability.
- Is versatile.
- Has realistic resource requirements.

SUMMARY OF THE UTILITY CRITERIA INTENDED USERS HAVE FOR A FRAMEWORK TO EVALUATE CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES

Phase 1 of this research identified the characteristics intended users require a framework for the evaluation of capacity development to display and the information they want an evaluation to provide. The research found that these characteristics and information needs were broader than those generally used in the sector (as specified in the DAC Criteria and Principles).

Consequently, the intended users’ information needs and the desired characteristics of a framework form the rubric against which the CDE Framework will be assessed in Phase 2 of this research. This rubric consists of:

1. Does the framework provide information on:
   - Changes as a result of the support?
   - Whether the objectives have been achieved and if not, what progress has been made toward sustainable achievement of the objective?
   - The impact of environmental factors on the initiative?
   - Whether the capacity development strategy was effective?
   - Lessons learned for application to this and other initiative?
2. Does the framework reflect the following characteristics:

- Easy to understand?
- Easy to use?
- Versatility?
- Realistic resource requirements?
- Supports a rigorous approach to M&E?
- Use and usability?

During the following stage (Phase 2), this rubric was used to assess the utility of the CDE Framework when applied on three initiatives. Each of these initiatives will form a separate case study.
Phase 2

The model is very stark in its results, you can’t ignore it. Some may try to gild the lily, but in this monitoring and evaluation due to the matrix arrangement and the progressive movement across the page, the [areas where there is no change] really stand out.
CHAPTER 5. PHASE 2: HOW WELL DOES THE CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT EVALUATION FRAMEWORK MEET USERS’ NEEDS?

The general area of this research is evaluation of capacity development programs in international development and specifically, whether “application of one of the available frameworks assists the evaluation of capacity development initiatives? If so, how does it do this?” As part of this, Phase 1 identified the criteria intended users would apply to judge the utility of a framework for evaluation of capacity development. These criteria encompassed two areas: the first are the characteristics intended users require a framework to demonstrate and second is the information they want evaluations of capacity development initiatives to provide.

In Phase 2, the research considered how well the criteria identified in Phase 1 were met when a framework was applied. This involved consideration of two questions:

• Does the framework provide the information required by intended users?

• Does the framework demonstrate the characteristics intended users have for a framework to evaluate capacity development?

This chapter presents these findings. The chapter initially discusses the rationale for selecting the CDE Framework as the framework that was tested and then describes the context in which international development assistance initiatives generally operate. Using this information, the basis for adopting a case study approach is discussed and the methodology specific to Phase 2 is presented. The methodology specific to each of the three case studies is included as part of that case study.

The context in which each of the three case studies operates is different, as is the stage of the project life cycle in which the CDE Framework was introduced. The way in which the CDE Framework was implemented, the resources available and the extent of visible management support are also each different. The chapter concludes with a brief summary of the findings in relation to the research question. The subsequent chapter documents the findings from a cross-case analysis of the three case studies and the consideration of possible alternative explanations for the outcomes.

Overall, this research found that application of the CDE Framework provided most of the information and characteristics intended users had specified for assessing the utility of a framework to evaluate capacity development. Users consistently reported that the Framework
had benefited each case study’s M&E and consequently, many team members had subsequently applied the Framework in different contexts.

WHICH FRAMEWORK TO ASSESS?

When this research commenced, there were three frameworks available to support the evaluation of capacity development. These were AusAID’s Stage Capacity Building Model (AusAID, 2006), ECDPM’s Balanced Framework (Watson, 2006) and the Capacity Development Evaluation (CDE) Framework (Kotvojs, 2009). This research did not test the first of these three models, AusAID’s Staged Capacity Building Model, as it reflected a narrow conception of capacity focused on the individual. The ECDPM Balanced Framework was not selected for two reasons. First, those interviewed for Phase 1 of this research who had experience with it identified that it was difficult to use. Second, an unpublished trial of the ECDPM undertaken in Papua New Guinea for AusAID (Baser, 2009, p. 43-45) found:

The [ECDPM] methodology is demanding in terms of its application ... Adopting the capacity framework in its entirety is a challenge beyond the resources of virtually any organization without some advance preparation. It requires understanding the underlying concepts (of capacity and systems) but also developing internal capabilities to be able to apply them. ... the initial investment in setting up a monitoring framework is substantial. ... [there is still] much work [required] for it to be a credible tool for making robust judgments about the growth of capacity.

Together these two factors indicated that at this stage, the Balanced Framework did not demonstrate half of the characteristics intended users required in a useful framework. Consequently, the CDE Framework was considered. A description of the CDE Framework follows.

The Capacity Development Evaluation (CDE) Framework

The CDE Framework was published in 2009 (Kotvojs, 2009). This Framework integrates program logic, dimensions of capacity development (based on UNDP’s [1997] four-element model) and time. The Framework is summarised in a diagrammatic form (Figure 4).
The key element of the Framework is the horizontal component consisting of a four level results chain. These elements are the:

- Output: what the activity produces. This is a tangible product, something that can be held.
- Immediate outcome: the application (or use) of the product.
- Intermediate outcome: the organisational change resulting from the application of the output.
- End outcome: a change in service delivery.

For each output and outcome level there is a single key evaluation question designed to determine whether capacity has been developed to that level (Figure 4). Under each of these specific questions, a series of questions is developed for the particular initiative being evaluated. These consider the changes in more detail.
A feedback loop is specifically included which requires the evaluation to ask whether the output or outcome has/has not been achieved and why/why not? This is referred to as the causality question and is intended to focus on contribution (including the contribution of other initiatives) and identification of factors constraining capacity development. Whenever the output/outcome is not achieved, the answer to this question is likely to indicate a problem arising at the preceding output or outcome level of the Framework. This will lead to a revision to the CDE Framework.

An indicative timeline is also included (Figure 4). Rather than being fixed, it is intended that this timeline should be modified to suit each initiative. In addition, where outputs or outcomes at the same level have different time frames, this should be identified.

In its vertical dimension, the CDE Framework captures the four capacity development elements identified by the UNDP (UNDP, 1997). While UNDP has since revised this to three levels, the CDE Framework has retained the original four to ensure that networks are specifically considered. The elements in this dimension are the:

- **Individual.** Capacity development may consider people’s understanding of their role, responsibility and accountability, skills, knowledge, motivation, confidence, participation, access to information, the adequacy of incentives and wages, and feedback.

- **Entity.** The entity may be a group, business unit, organisation, community or institution. Capacity development targets items within the entity’s control. This includes its mission, vision, culture, values, strategies, policies, systems, procedures, processes, competencies and resources.

- **Networks** are the interrelationships between entities. This refers to both internal and external relationships, formal and informal.

- **Enabling environment** includes items that are outside, but impact upon, the entity. The entity may be able to influence these things, but it is not able to control them. Examples include legislation, government policy and budget allocation. These items often present risks to achievement of the planned outcomes.

These four levels also reflect four broad entry points and strategies for development of capacity. For example, capacity development strategies may target one or a combination of the following: (i) the individual; (ii) the organisation or a particular business unit within the organisation; (iii)
internal or external networks, and have an entry point at that level, or (iv) the enabling environment.

A ‘picture of success’ is defined for the output and at each outcome level. This describes the specific changes required to be able to conclude that the output or outcome level was successfully achieved. While quantitative indicators may form part of the picture, the focus is on the qualitative description. Ideally, the picture of success should be developed with partners through in-depth dialogue, but as a minimum must be agreed with partners before implementation commences. Indicators may then be developed from the picture of success.

The risks associated with achieving the output and each outcome level are also identified. As a consequence of identifying the risks, the need for different outputs or outcomes may be identified. This would lead to revisions in the design and CDE Framework. In addition to identifying the risks as part of the CDE Framework, the management strategy to address each risk should be documented separately in a risk management plan.

In summary, the CDE Framework considers successful capacity development to occur as a result of support targeting a combination of individuals, the entity, network and enabling environment. If successful, this will be demonstrated by application of the specific products developed, change in the organisation or entity and ultimately service delivery. In addition, the CDE Framework recognises that a long timeframe is usually required for the development of capacity; however the time frame required is specific to each initiative. As with the time frame, through the causality question (“why, why not”), the CDE Framework recognises that capacity development is not a simple linear system and the logic should be reviewed and revised regularly to respond to changes.

**RESEARCH DESIGN FOR PHASE 2: ADOPTING A CASE STUDY APPROACH**

The context in which international development initiatives operate, capacity development is undertaken and evaluations are implemented is complex, dynamic and varied. At its broadest for example, the country in which the initiative is operating may be a fragile state, post-conflict or have a stable government. In addition, each government’s M&E policy will vary. At the initiative level, external stakeholder support for the initiative, the level of resources, M&E capacity, management structures, roles and responsibilities will all vary. Furthermore, the sectors in which capacity development is occurring will vary, as will the duration and size of the initiative. Compounding this, implementation of the initiative being evaluated is unpredictable;
the direction of the initiative itself can change and the goals can increase or reduce. At the extreme, the M&E (or the whole initiative) can be expanded, suspended or even terminated by the client. This context may be significant in the evaluation of capacity development.

Where an initiative has adopted a capacity development approach, the boundary between the initiative and the work of partner agencies is usually indistinct. In addition, the boundaries between implementation of M&E activities and the initiative itself may be equally indistinct. As a consequence, many of those involved in the initiative (stakeholders) will have a different perspective of these boundaries, and more broadly, the context and reality.

Thus, truth can be seen as subjective, with:

- no single reality on which inquiry may converge, but rather there are multiple realities that are socially constructed....These multiple and constructed realities cannot be studied in pieces (as variables, for example), but holistically, since the pieces are interrelated in such a way as to influence all other pieces. (Lincoln and Guba, 1986, p. 75).

In addition, in the dynamic environment in which initiatives operate, it would be difficult to predict in advance what will be experienced. In such an environment, it is essential to have an understanding of the entire process involved in applying the CDE Framework and how this process may have influenced the final result (Balbach, 1999; GAO, 1990; Keen & Packwood, 1995). Therefore, the complexities of context and perception must be reflected in the research design.

In order to be able to investigate in depth the different experiences of reality, and how these change over time and interrelate to create the multiple realities that are in operation during the life of an initiative, this research will use a case study approach. The case study has been described as “a method of learning about a complex instance, based on a comprehensive understanding of that instance obtained by extensive description and analysis of the instance taken as a whole and in its context” (GAO, 1990, p. 79). Case studies “investigate a contemporary phenomenon in depth and within its real life context” (Yin, 2009, p. 18) and “retain the holistic and meaningful characteristics of real life events” (Yin, 2009, p. 4). Through this, a case study approach enables the researcher to capture the “multiplicity of perspectives which are rooted in a specific context” (Lewis, 2003, p. 52) which Yin (2009, p. 18) identifies as being particularly important “when the boundaries between the phenomenon and context are not clearly evident”.
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Through adoption of a case study approach, the research seeks to avoid what Perrin (2001, p. 253) described as a major weakness of evaluations (and no doubt research): the “lack of adequate understanding of a program’s nature, context, and constraints ... [resulting in evaluations which] too often address inappropriate questions and generate meaningless findings—or worse”.

Yin (2009) identified five major components of case study research design:

- The study’s questions. For this research, the research question is “Does the application of one of the available frameworks assist the evaluation of capacity development initiatives?”

- A series of propositions. Yin notes that for exploratory case studies (as is this research), propositions may not be appropriate. In this case, there should be a series of initial research questions. These are set out at the start of this chapter.

- The unit of analysis; ‘a case’. The unit of analysis for this research is a development assistance initiative. This may be a project, program or facility to which the framework is being applied.

- Logic linking the data to the research; cross-case analysis was used to link the data to the research.

- Criteria for interpreting the findings. These are the criteria identified by intended users in Phase 1.

Thus, this research phase adopted a case study approach. The population of development assistance initiatives from which the case studies were selected were characterised by:

- Use of the CDE Framework.

- Being funded by AusAID as this was the primary donor with whom intended users worked and by minimising the number of donors, the complexities associated with approvals and the potential for delay was reduced.

- Implementation of the initiative being planned to coincide with at least 18 months of the research period to enable data to be collected over a period of sufficient length to be of value.

- Managing contractors who supported the inclusion of the initiative in the research. The support of the managing contractor and the initiatives management team was essential to
be able to conduct the research. Their support was needed to facilitate approvals for the research from partner agencies and interviews with partners and advisers. This selection criterion was likely to result in the management team for each case study being supportive of evaluation.

- An AusAID management team, the partner agency and the managing contractor who were each willing to make the research findings public.

The population was identified through personal knowledge of the researcher, informal discussions with AusAID and managing contractor staff, and asking all those interviewed in Phase 1 to identify initiatives applying frameworks to evaluate capacity development. This identified only three initiatives that met the criteria, two in Indonesia and one in Solomon Islands. These three initiatives were used as cases for this research. These cases encompassed the breadth of environmental variables most likely to occur when implementing such initiatives (Table 11). This facilitated identification of commonalities and differences across different situations and supported extraction of information to enable users to apply the new knowledge to other relevant contexts.

**Data Collection.**

For Phase 2, data was collected through interviews and document review. The interviews comprised only those intended users who were directly involved in one of the three case studies. Thus, for each case study there was only a small population from which to sample. This included managers from both AusAID and the managing contractor; members of independent review teams and the internal M&E team and leaders of teams of advisers. Consequently, rather than selecting a sample from these intended user groups; all were invited to participate in this research and all agreed to participate. However, as there was a large number of counterpart agency managers, counterparts and advisers for the two case studies in Indonesia sample selection was necessary. The selection criteria for partners and advisers were that they were:

- Involved in the design or implementation of the M&E, or in the use of the findings.
- Willing to participate in the research.
- Articulate; and
- Included a mix of people who supported M&E and some who opposed M&E.
### Table 11. Characteristics of each initiative used as a case study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Solomon Islands Government Housing Project (SIGHMP)</th>
<th>Australia Indonesia Partnership – Decentralisation (AIPD)</th>
<th>Australia Indonesia Partnership – Economic Governance (AIPEG)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country in which initiative located</strong></td>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extent of conflict within the country</strong></td>
<td>Post-conflict</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sector in which capacity is being developed</strong></td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Rural development</td>
<td>Economic Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geographic coverage</strong></td>
<td>Based in one location.</td>
<td>Multiple locations in Indonesia.</td>
<td>Multiple locations in Jakarta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value of initiative (AUD)</strong></td>
<td>$7.2m</td>
<td>$61m</td>
<td>$66m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duration of initiative</strong></td>
<td>3 years with a 2 year extension</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aid modality used to deliver assistance</strong></td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initiative’s management structure</strong></td>
<td>Managing contractor appointed a part-time Contractor representative.</td>
<td>AusAID staff member as full-time Program Director and Assistant Program Directors.</td>
<td>Managing contractor appointed a full-time Program Director.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management support for M&amp;E</strong></td>
<td>Contractor representative seen to be supportive of M&amp;E.</td>
<td>Program Director seen to be supportive of M&amp;E.</td>
<td>Program Director supportive of M&amp;E but this is not visible to advisers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources allocated to M&amp;E</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>2.8% of program budget (excluding personnel).</td>
<td>Less than 1.5% of program budget (including personnel).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human resources to support M&amp;E</strong></td>
<td>1 month of support from an unqualified and inexperienced adviser.</td>
<td>Qualified full-time national and part-time international M&amp;E Specialist from before the program started.</td>
<td>Full-time national one year after program commencement and part-time qualified international M&amp;E Specialist from six months after program commencement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experience of team in M&amp;E</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Generally limited.</td>
<td>Generally very limited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>When the CDE Framework was introduced</strong></td>
<td>In the last 18 months of the initiative.</td>
<td>At the start of the program prior to activity design commencing.</td>
<td>After 1 year of implementation during which period many activities had been designed and implementation commenced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning for M&amp;E</strong></td>
<td>One month in parallel with implementation of activities.</td>
<td>1 year – before activities commenced (except for small ‘quick win’ activities outside the M&amp;E Plan)</td>
<td>Three months in parallel with activity design and implementation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Those who met these criteria were identified by either the M&E Adviser or Program Director on these initiatives. While this could have resulted in selection of a sample who were more supportive of M&E, from the responses of those interviewed, this does not appear to be the case. All these people were then invited to participate in the research and all accepted this invitation (Table 12). This resulted in a total of 50 different people being interviewed over 65 interviews.

Table 12. Number of people interviewed from each user group for each case study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study</th>
<th>AusAID</th>
<th>Managing contractor</th>
<th>Team Leader &amp; Adviser</th>
<th>Sub-contractor</th>
<th>Independent M&amp;E</th>
<th>Partner Agency</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SIGHMP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIPD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIPEG</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The documents from which data was drawn included those publicly available via websites and reports on the initiatives prepared for management or AusAID. These documents varied between case studies and are consequently identified separately in each case study.

In addition, the stage of the project life cycle at which data collection commenced varied between case studies. This was a function of when application of the CDE Framework commenced on the initiative, when the initiative commenced in relation to the research and when approval was received to include the initiative as a case study. Consequently, data was collected during the design phase for two of the case studies (AIPD and AIPEG). This data was analysed and reported at the completion of the design stage (Kotvojs and Hurworth, 2011). The findings from this analysis were then used to inform the data collected during the remainder of the data collection process. A preliminary analysis of data collected from the third case study (SIGHMP) was undertaken when SIGHMP finished. However, as this was before Phase 1 of this research was completed, this analysis was repeated when analysis of Phase 1 was completed.
and all data for Phase 2 had been collected. This was at the same time as the final analysis of the
data collected for the AIPD and AIPEG case studies.

Each of the three case studies is presented in the remainder of this chapter. For each case study,
a brief background is provided, followed by the elements of the methodology particular to that
case study. The case study presents the experience of those interviewed on how well the CDE
Framework met users’ needs as identified in Phase 1 (Chapter 4). This is followed by a discussion
of users’ experience leading to a conclusion which answers the research question “Does the
application of one of the available frameworks assist the evaluation of capacity development
initiatives? If so, how” in relation to this initiative.

A cross-case analysis of the findings from the three case studies is reported in Chapter 6.
Alternative explanations for the findings are also analysed in Chapter 6.
SOLOMON ISLANDS GOVERNMENT HOUSING MANAGEMENT PROJECT (SIGHMP)

Overview of the Solomon Islands Government Housing Management Project Phase 2.

Box 4. Overview of the Solomon Islands Government Housing Management Project Phase 2.

(Source: AusAID, 2006; Blamey & Gorapava, 2008; Deacon & Kudu, 2011; SIGHMP Phase 2, 2009, 2010a, b, c & d, & 2011)

The Program

In Solomon Islands, the Government Housing Division (GHD) has responsibility for provision of housing to almost all Solomon Islands public servants as a part of employees’ conditions of employment. Thus, GHD performance is critical to public servant satisfaction and the Government’s ability to appoint public servants to specific locations. Consequently, GHD’s functioning plays a major role in both the delivery of public services across Solomon Islands and Government expenditure. However, there were significant problems with the government housing portfolio due to virtual policy and regulatory vacuums; serious disrepair due to limited maintenance; unplanned and uncoordinated sale of houses; and squatters and former public servants illegally occupying government houses. As a result, housing was a major financial and management problem for the Solomon Islands Government.

At the request of the Solomon Islands Government, AusAID funded the Solomon Islands Government Housing Management Project (SIGHMP) to develop GHD’s capacity in policy development, regulatory and policy frameworks, and tenancy and property management. Capacity development was undertaken by a small number of advisers through a variety of training approaches including formal training, on-the-job training and coaching.

Phase 2 of this support commenced in June 2006 for three years with a $5m budget. At its scheduled completion in June 2009, the Solomon Islands Government requested an additional period of support for the GHD to consolidate capacity development as they recognised that the benefits would not be sustainable. A two-year extension was approved to the end of June 2011. This period was known as the Transition Period with a further $2.2m budget.
The project was part of the broader AusAID funded Machinery of Government Program (MoG). The MoG was managed on behalf of AusAID by GRM Pty Ltd – the managing contractor. Cardno Pty Ltd won the tender for SIGHMP and, as a sub-contractor, had responsibility for implementing SIGHMP.

**Development of SIGHMP’s M&E System**

Internal M&E for the first three years of the Program focused on the production of outputs and achievement of quantitative indicators. However, data was not available to measure many of the specified quantitative indicators. There was no monitoring or evaluation of capacity development.

With the Transition Period’s focus on capacity development, SIGHMP’s internal M&E was revised to measure and report on capacity development progress. As AusAID did not approve a budget for internal M&E, Cardno sought to apply a simple framework for evaluation of capacity development that would not require M&E specialist support. As the CDE Framework appeared to meet this criterion and, keen to support further research into the M&E of capacity development, Cardno agreed to apply the CDE Framework.

Cardno selected a young professional to develop the M&E Plan as part of his professional development program. He was not experienced in M&E. This young professional facilitated a series of stakeholder workshops in Solomon Islands in February 2010, and based on these, prepared the M&E Plan. The targets for each element of capacity (individual, entity, network and enabling environment) for each output and outcome level were based on position descriptions, regulations, formalised agreements with other agencies and law. The young professional then met with stakeholders to discuss the draft document, finalised and then submitted the Plan that was approved by AusAID in April 2010. Thus, the M&E Plan was only implemented for the last 18 months of SIGHMP.

Implementation of the M&E Plan consisted of the Team Leader and counterparts meeting on a four-monthly basis and discussing a series of questions specified in the M&E Plan for each element of capacity for each output and outcome level. The Team Leader documented the answers in a matrix and developed recommendations. The matrix and recommendations were submitted to the managing contractor, AusAID and GHD.

More broadly, there were a number of efforts to establish an M&E framework for the MoG. The establishment of a framework was delayed. When implemented, the MoG M&E framework was generally deemed by all those interviewed to be cursory, lacking in rigour and ineffective. This research does not consider the M&E undertaken as part of the MoG M&E.
Methodology.

The methodology used to collect and analyse data for each case study was discussed earlier in this chapter. Those characteristics unique to SIGHMP are briefly presented here.

Data on application of the CDE Framework to SIGHMP was collected from after the M&E Plan was first applied (May 2010) until the end of the Project (June 2011) through interviews and document review. The Team Leader was also interviewed after completion of the project and provided subsequent reflective comment. Initial interviews considered application of the CDE Framework to developing the M&E Plan and the first round of implementation. Subsequent interviews considered the repeated implementation of the CDE Framework. However, repeat interviews with partners were cancelled due to changes in their schedules, and poor communication with Solomon Islands precluded conducting these interviews using Skype or telephone. Consequently, the period over which data was collected from partners is limited and only the Team Leader was interviewed on a repeated basis.

A total of 12 interviews were conducted (Table 13). Three of these interviews involved groups of two or three users – always from the same user group. While English was a second language for many of those interviewed, translators were not required. Due to timing of SIGHMP’s completion, these interviews were all finished before Phase 1 of this research was completed. Consequently, the data collected was not focussed on the specific characteristics and information needs identified in Phase 1 of this research. Instead, the interview focussed on the difference in the user’s experience of M&E using the CDE Framework and before this, the information the CDE Framework provided and the information they wanted but did not receive, and what they found challenging in applying the Framework.

In addition to interviews, data was collected from a range of documents. These included external documents (the Project Design Document, the Independent Mid-term Review, the Independent Completion Report and a World Bank review) and internal documents (the M&E Plan and associated documents and all Four-Monthly Reports). These documents are listed in Appendix F.

The data was analysed after Phase 1 analysis was completed. At that time, additional information was sought from the Team Leader on aspects that had not been addressed in the initial series of interviews.
Table 13. Number of people interviewed during design and implementation of SIGHMP’s M&E system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. people (implementation)</th>
<th>Donor</th>
<th>Managing contractor</th>
<th>Team Leader &amp; Adviser</th>
<th>Sub-contractor</th>
<th>M&amp;E role</th>
<th>Partner agency</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. interviews</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings.

Overall, this research found that the use of the CDE Framework was considered to benefit the SIGHMP’s M&E. Most of the intended users’ information needs were met and the CDE Framework demonstrated the characteristics they required of a framework to evaluate capacity development (Chapter 4). The interviews also identified a range of other benefits resulting from the use of the CDE Framework and that those who used the Framework on SIGHMP had applied the Framework elsewhere. This was largely due to the simple definition of output and the outcome combined with the specification of the four elements of capacity development as defined by UNDP (1997). Together this highlighted to the team areas where capacity development had not occurred or was unlikely to be sustainable, enabling actions that targeted these areas to be implemented in the final year of SIGHMP.

**Characteristics of a useful framework for evaluation of capacity development.**

This section presents the findings on the CDE Framework’s ability to demonstrate the characteristics users required (Chapter 4) when applied to SIGHMP.

**Easy to understand: Simplicity of language, concepts and presentation.**

Those involved with SIGHMP consistently indicated that the CDE Framework was easy to understand. The Team Leader reported that it was “easy to see how [the CDE Framework] works”\textsuperscript{cxxxviii}. He described it as logical and believed this to be one of the Framework’s strengths\textsuperscript{cxxxix}. In a subsequent interview, he added “I have stuck [the CDE Framework] ... on the board beside me so that people see it. It is very comprehensive and it is also easy to follow
compared to the previous one. He explained that when people looked at the Framework they:

Find it very easy to see how the M&E is structured and how it ends up on the right hand side. Without exception, everyone that I have shown it to finds this. Some management tools you need to explain, but for this one, it is readily apparent how it works.

This simplicity and logic meant that both advisers and counterparts understood the Framework. In addition, the CDE Framework clarified their understanding of outcomes and capacity development, promoting a capacity development and outcomes focus.

Thus, those on SIGHMP found that the CDE Framework was easy to understand as they considered it to be virtually self-explanatory, largely due to its presentation and language.

**Easy to use:** *Practical rather than theoretical in implementation. Integrated into activity implementation rather than a separate function. Does not require M&E expertise to implement.*

As applied on SIGHMP, the CDE Framework was found to be very easy to use. This is most evident because there were no resources allocated to SIGHMP for internal M&E. Consequently, the development of the M&E Plan was facilitated by a young professional as part of his professional development. Following this, the Team Leader implemented each round of monitoring. Given that the Team Leader was able to successfully apply the Framework and produce useful results without having previous experience in M&E, the CDE Framework was not dependent on M&E expertise. As the managing contractor explained, the Team Leader “is across [the CDE Framework], so it has good usability as [he] is not an M&E expert.”

The Team Leader found the CDE Framework easy to apply the first time he used it. After implementing the CDE Framework for a second time, the Team Leader said “It was OK to do, it was easier and smoother than the first time because we all knew what to expect.” As a consequence of its ease of use and ability to provide the information he needed, the Team Leader has since applied the CDE Framework to other programs on which he has worked.

The internal M&E on SIGHMP was undertaken as a separate activity rather than being integrated into other activities. However, it is likely that this is a consequence of introduction of the M&E in the last year of the initiative. There is no evidence to suggest whether the CDE Framework promoted integration or otherwise.
The CDE Framework was found to be easy to apply on SIGHMP for those with limited or no M&E experience and not dependent on the availability of M&E expertise.

**Realistic resource requirements.** Requirements for human, time and financial resources are not significant and the benefits outweigh the resource costs. Ideally, limited requirement for data.

As previously explained, Cardno self-funded establishing and implementing the M&E system because there was no Project budget for internal M&E. Consequently, there was minimal funding available for internal M&E. This is reflected in the Team Leader’s comment that: “the M&E framework was not very expensive to implement”\(^{cxlv}\). Likewise, from AusAID’s perspective “it didn’t use any resources or time”\(^{cxlvi}\).

Partners did not identify any problems with the amount of time that the M&E took. In fact, they suggested that longer could have been allocated to planning the M&E because they did not have a prior understanding of capacity development. Consequently, learning about the concept of capacity development extended the amount of time required for planning the M&E\(^{cxlvii}\).

The Team Leader facilitated the application of the Framework every four months. The first time he led the M&E, he found that “it didn’t really take all that long to collect the data [but] … there was a fair bit of work in preparing the report”\(^{cxlviii}\). He then explained that this was also because this was the first time they had considered capacity development. Overall, he concluded that the time required was not excessive. The second time the Team Leader facilitated this process, he found it was faster and required less than three or four hours to complete. However, because the Team Leader collected the data through a series of group discussions, each interrupted when team members served clients, the time for data collection was probably expanded\(^{cxlix}\).

The team designed the M&E System to collect data on capacity development through group discussion with partners and existing documents. This provided the team with all the data they required to answer the key evaluation questions. Consequently, the team conclude that use of the CDE Framework did not have unrealistic requirements for data.

In a context where there was no budget for internal monitoring provided by the client, resource requirements were minimal and realistic, and the data required was realistic.

**Rigour.** Supports implementation of rigorous, but not excessive, evaluations with honest findings. While quantitative analysis was often desired, this was not a consistent element of this criterion.
All users interviewed agreed that the internal M&E had been conducted with rigour. For example, all members of the independent review team concluded that the internal M&E undertaken by the team was rigorous\(^{cl}\) as reflected by the statement, “The M&E that the program carried out was rigorous. It was well planned and implemented. They involved the Ministry as well so it was properly handled”\(^{cl}\).

A number of those interviewed attributed this rigour with the CDE Framework. This is clearly reflected by the AusAID manager’s statement that:

> The new framework ... showed you ... much more, ... you can’t hide it, not that people are necessarily trying to hide it. It is more grounded, more definite. To monitor things well we need to get to this point, so that you are actually saying, ‘so this is the skills and knowledge that you need’, and at the end of the day, we see if we have or have not built the skills and knowledge\(^{cli}\).

Similarly, the Team Leader reflected that it would be “very hard to hide problems”\(^{clii}\). He believes this was because the application of the CDE Framework made the process “really clinical”\(^{cliv}\).

The rigour described by the AusAID manager and the clinical approach described by the Team Leader is possibly a consequence of the approach the team used to develop the minimum requirements for each capacity element. They derived these from position descriptions (for the individual element), government regulation (for the entity level), agreed roles with other agencies (for the network level) and Solomon Islands Government laws (for the enabling environment)\(^{clv}\). Once documented during M&E planning, there was clarity in what was required. Through this approach, SIGHMP clearly documented their picture of success.

In line with this, the Team Leader noted that the CDE Framework contributed to rigour by ensuring that all aspects of the Project were considered – not just the high profile events. Reflecting this, he considered the CDE Framework:

> Has added value to the program. Before, I was tending to look at the good news stories through rose coloured glasses. These stories tended to be high profile. In some of the lower profile areas, we found they were not going so well and using the M&E framework highlighted this. We knew why some areas were going well or not going well, but this monitoring also brought out unexpected reasons and we have been able to make a quick fix and address the issues\(^{clvi}\).
From the interviews, it is clear that the CDE Framework did support rigorous internal M&E. This appears to be through the clear and detailed specification of what was to be achieved at the output and outcome level and then assessing against this.

**Versatility.** Applicable at different levels of a system; in different sectors and cultures; for different size agencies; for initiatives of different size, implementation strategy and stage in project life-cycle; enable a variety of M&E methodologies.

Across all user groups, those who used the Framework indicated that it had been suitable for SIGHMP and they believed it would be applicable in other contexts. Several have since applied the Framework in Indonesia and Papua New Guinea.

The AusAID manager believed that the Framework was applicable in other contexts because it required the users to define what they meant by ‘developing capacity of individuals’. In her experience, “there is a lot of talk about developing the capacity of the individual but there is not a lot of talk about what this really means”\(^{clvii}\). Similarly, the Team Leader believed that the Framework would be suitable for application to other initiatives\(^{clviii}\). He subsequently applied the CDE Framework in Papua New Guinea\(^ {clix}\).

Although the managing contractor did not need to use a framework for M&E on SIGHMP, the representative identified that he would like to “use something similar”\(^{clx}\) on the next program he managed. He also noted that he had “used something similar [on a previous program], but it was not as well thought out, planned or considered as this”\(^{clxi}\). Since then, he oversaw the introduction of the CDE Framework on a large education sector program he leads in Indonesia.

These comments indicate that those who used the CDE Framework on SIGHMP considered the Framework versatile.

**Use and usability.** Findings support use and are provided in a timely manner. Findings can be used to support the partner agency in planning and decision-making; the donor in program planning and implementation of other activities; and communication with stakeholders; and also meet the information needs of the program.

All user groups reported that the CDE Framework supported the use of M&E through the timeliness with which findings were available and providing the information they required.
Application of the CDE Framework every four months by the team meant that they obtained the findings in a timely manner. This frequency of application was possible because of the Framework’s simplicity and its application did not require input from an M&E expert.

The information provided by the CDE Framework met users’ needs. For example, counterparts reported that the findings identified weaknesses in what they were doing through the focus on behaviour and organisational change. This enabled them to determine how to address the weaknesses and also supported their forward planning at an operational level\textsuperscript{cix}. Similarly, the Team Leader indicated that the issues identified by applying the CDE Framework supported the team to plan strategies to address gaps in capacities essential for sustainable outcomes. In part this was through asking the causality question as part of the feedback loop\textsuperscript{cxi}. The team also used these findings “to inform discussions concerning the training plan for the [subsequent] year\textsuperscript{cxii}. This was supported by the independent review team who reported that the implementation team had used the findings to develop a series of recommendations in relation to project implementation that were subsequently implemented\textsuperscript{cxxxv}. However, those interviewed considered it unlikely that the findings were used at a strategic level due to lack of continuity in the Permanent Secretary’s position\textsuperscript{cxlvi}.

The managing contractor found that the CDE Framework also provided them with the information they needed. For example, the Framework clearly identified the implications at the outcome level of proposed and actual changes to activities. In this way, the CDE Framework was considered to become “a risk management tool”\textsuperscript{cxvii}. With this knowledge, the managing contractor conducted discussions with the Permanent Secretary to address the potential challenges. In addition, the managing contractor reported that the findings produced from application of the CDE Framework would have supported reporting to AusAID. However, due to AusAID’s narrow reporting parameters, they believed this had not occurred on SIGHMP\textsuperscript{cxviii}.

The AusAID manager also concluded that the design of the Framework supported use of the findings. From her perspective, critical was the fact that “It is more grounded, more definite”\textsuperscript{cxix} than approaches in which most users were experienced. This meant that findings were unambiguous, thus facilitating use.

The CDE Framework had demonstrated a high degree of usability. The simplicity of the Framework enabled the team to implement monitoring on a frequent basis. Combined with the focus on different capacity development elements (the vertical component), the focus of
evaluation questions on behavioural and organisational change and the causality question which required consideration of why outcomes had not been achieved supported timely production of relevant information. This contributed to use of findings.

Summary

Overall, the CDE Framework demonstrated the characteristics intended users had established for framework for evaluation of capacity development to be useful (Table 14).

Questions the Framework is to answer.

What has changed? Planned change in individual's knowledge, skills and behaviour and the organisation. To a lesser extent, contribution and unintended change

There was agreement among all those interviewed that use of the CDE Framework had identified what had and had not changed at both the individual and organisational level. Those interviewed believed that this had not been possible prior to introduction of the CDE Framework.

The ability of the CDE Framework to demonstrate both what had and had not changed was perceived as a clear strength of the Framework. For example, a member of the independent review team stated, “The monitoring framework they used did show the changes that occurred. I really liked that”. This position was supported by the AusAID manager who said that through application of the CDE Framework “You could definitely see where there had been gains or losses”. While the Team Leader agreed that change (or lack of change) was clearly demonstrated, in all interviews he emphasised it was not possible to hide these findings:

The model is very stark in its results, you can’t ignore it. Some may try to gild the lily, but in this M&E due to the matrix arrangement and the progressive movement across the page, the [areas where there is no change] really stand out.

This is also reflected in the previous discussion on the rigour associated with application of the CDE Framework on SIGHMP.
Table 14. Summary of performance of CDE Framework on SIGHMP against characteristics users require.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>CDE Framework’s demonstration of the required characteristics on SIGHMP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easy to understand</td>
<td>Simplicity of language, concepts and presentation.</td>
<td>✓ Considered to be virtually self explanatory largely due to presentation. Vertical element of the Framework easy to understand.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Easy to use                     | Practical rather than theoretical in implementation. Integrated into activity implementation rather than a separate function. Does not require M&E expertise to implement. | ✓ Easy to apply for those with limited or no M&E experience.  
|                                 |                                                                           | ✓ Not dependent on the availability of M&E expertise.                   |
|                                 |                                                                           | ? Not integrated into activities due to timing of introduction.         |
| Realistic Resource Requirements  | Requirements for human, time and financial resources are not significant and the benefits outweigh the resource costs. Ideally, limited requirement for data. | ✓ In a context where there was no budget for internal monitoring provided by the client, resource requirements were minimal and realistic. The benefits were seen to outweigh the costs.  
|                                 |                                                                           | ✓ Data requirements were realistic.                                     |
| Rigour                          | Supports implementation of rigorous, but not excessive, evaluations with honest findings. While quantitative analysis was often desired, this was not a consistent element of this criterion. | ✓ Supported honest findings as CDE Framework made hiding problems difficult due to clearly defining each element of capacity for each output and outcome level. |
| Versatility                     | Applicable at different levels of a system; in different sectors and cultures; for different sized agencies; for initiatives of different size, implementation strategy and stage in project life-cycle; enable a variety of M&E methodologies. | ✓ All those who used the CDE Framework concluded it was suitable for SIGHMP.  
|                                 |                                                                           | ✓ Several have since applied the Framework on other initiatives and in different countries. |
| Use and usability                | Findings support use and are provided in a timely manner. Findings can be used to support the partner agency in planning and decision-making; the donor in program planning and implementation of other activities; and communication with stakeholders; and also meet the information needs of the program. | ✓ Supported decision making at operational levels. This is possibly through the focus of questions on application of outputs and why outcomes have not been achieved, the Framework’s simplicity supporting frequent application and its explicit nature.  
|                                 |                                                                           | ? There is no evidence that it supported decision-making at strategic levels. |
Significantly, SIGHMP’s previous approach to M&E had not identified either change or lack of change. This difference was attributed by the AusAID manager to the “more grounded, more definite” approach of the CDE Framework in comparison to the previous approach. She went on to explain:

I don’t think the M&E before [this] drilled down to look at the capacity individuals needed to have to build an effective change. This is what I liked about the Framework, it looked to the competencies and if people had them or not, and then whether they apply them or not. ... The monitoring did show whether people were applying what they had learned.

Both the Team Leader and AusAID manager reported change was identified through the horizontal element of the CDE Framework. For example, each noted that at the individual level, the horizontal results chain required clear identification of the competencies individuals required (effectively the picture of success) and then monitored against these.

Perhaps the contribution of the CDE Framework to identification of the presence or absence of change on SIGHMP is best summarised in the following quote from the Project’s Final Progress Report:

The design and application of the particular M&E model developed for the final Transition Phase of the Housing Project [the CDE Framework] starkly reveals the true picture in counterparts’ capacity development. The model identifies, measures and comments on changes in capacity at the level of the individual, the Government Housing Division (GHD) as an entity, the network in which the GHD operates, and the GHD’s enabling environment.

The AusAID manager and the advisers stated that they were able to determine whether SIGHMP had contributed to the changes identified. However, from their responses it is not clear whether they were able to assess the contribution of SIGHMP to change through use of the CDE Framework or through other means.

In summary, the CDE Framework enabled change at an individual and organisational to be identified. Prior to introduction of the CDE Framework, this had not been possible. Overall, it appears that the CDE Framework also supported assessment of SIGHMP contribution to achieve this change.
What progress has been made toward sustainable achievement of the objective? Has the original objective been achieved and if not, what progress has been made toward its sustainable achievement?

There was general agreement among intended user groups that the CDE Framework supported identification of progress towards, and achievement of, the objective, and identified whether these gains were sustainable. In addition, those interviewed considered that the CDE Framework provided this information more effectively than the previous M&E approach.

All stakeholders interviewed agreed that the CDE Framework had enabled progress towards outcomes to be identified. This was through the “four levels in this model [which] can tell the reader things started from a standing start and how they progressed against the agreed timeline. There was also general agreement that the previous framework would not have enabled progress to be assessed. For example, when the mechanism for achieving an outcome changed, the managing contractor’s team stated that through the CDE Framework “we were able to show that in spite of having no oversight task force the work still happened and this could get captured. It could not have been captured in the old M&E structure.”

Not only did the CDE Framework show where progress was occurring, it also identified where progress was not occurring. The Team Leader concluded, “it really showed the inadequacy of what was happening. It would be very hard to hide problems. It brings out the true situation very starkly, it makes pretty ugly reading in some parts.” In part this was a consequence of the CDE Framework forcing the team to look at progress across all areas of the Project, not only the more obvious areas. The managing contractor confirmed this and indicated that when the team first applied the CDE Framework “They found that there was a lot of ‘not applicable’, things that were not being done yet. The capacities in these areas had not yet been demonstrated. The Team Leader recognised that without using the CDE Framework “I would have known the problems, but not to this level.”

The Team Leader believed that the increased visibility of areas where progress was not occurring was a consequence of the CDE Framework’s “matrix arrangement and progressive movement across the page.” The Team Leader also suggested that where there was a problem with progress, the cause was often identified through application of the causality question as “we found the things that stymied us on one level, were usually due to a problem at the previous level.”
The design for SIGHMP project was output focussed. This, combined with the management structure meant the managing contractor did not report on either outcomes or progress towards outcomes. However, when interviewed, they stated “had we been responsible for reporting on the actual outcomes, something like this Framework would have fed into the reporting in terms of outcomes ... It would have fed in more seamlessly than the old system.

Prior to completion of the project, the CDE Framework clearly showed that SIGHMP’s objective would only be partially achieved. Through the early identification of the likely failure to achieve the objective fully, a strategy to address this was identified and implemented before the initiative was completed. Despite this action, the CDE Framework demonstrated that at the completion of the project, objectives were not fully achieved. For example, the Project’s final report states that the CDE Framework “reveals the true picture of counterparts’ capacity development. ... Capacity is shown to be strong in some areas such as tenancy management, but weak in other areas such as strategic analysis and making high level recommendations to the Solomon Islands Government.

Although the Project Design Document identified that sustainability was critical and underpinned the proposed approach, sustainability does not seem to have been a significant consideration among all stakeholders. The intent expressed in the Project Design Document seems to have been lost to some stakeholders as reflected by a member of the independent review team: “Sustainability wasn’t really an issue [the Independent Review] looked at as AusAID said that the program was closing anyway. This general lack of consideration of sustainability by many stakeholders is also reflected in numerous responses during interviews for this research such as “we didn’t need this information”. Consequently, a number of stakeholders were not able to comment on whether the Framework had provided information on sustainability.

However, the Team Leader was very conscious of sustainability. He used the CDE Framework to identify the likelihood of sustainability of outcomes and concluded, “it was really very obvious from the M&E framework what will be sustained and what will not”. As a result, following introduction of the CDE Framework, he concluded in the quarterly report:

Information gathered [using the M&E] clearly points to good prospects of sustainability in the area of tenancy management, and positive outlooks in other areas. However, the
design and approach of this particular M&E process starkly highlights shortcomings in other areas.

The managing contractor representatives also confirmed that the M&E provided information on sustainability to the team and partners. They believed that the CDE Framework provided this information more effectively and efficiently than the previous system.

In summary, application of the CDE Framework to SIGHMP identified both progress and lack of progress and also the extent to which the objective had been achieved. Progress was demonstrated by movement through the four horizontal output and outcome levels. In addition, the cause of lack of progress was identified through application of the causality question.

**Was the capacity development strategy effective? Did the capacity development strategy work?**

Application of the CDE Framework on SIGHMP identified the capacity development strategies that worked and those that did not. The ability of the CDE Framework to identify effective capacity development strategies was recognised both internally and externally. For example, the contribution of the CDE Framework to identifying effective capacity development strategies is reflected in the Team Leader’s words:

> The evaluation most definitely did show how effective different strategies had been in developing capacity. Some tasks involved collegial effort and these worked well. Those that they did independently, did not progress as well. You could see this from the pace of progress [horizontal component]. ... I would have been aware of this in general terms through the performance reporting, but not to the level of detail that was available in the M&E that we did.

This was supported by a member of the independent review team who stated, “the M&E highlighted how the changes occurred”. He then went on to say that:

> because [identification of what strategies worked and didn’t work] was done internally, they came up with a lot of suggestions and recommendations that were good, they didn’t hide issues and they spelt out what was needed to be done and what was achievable.

Limited data was collected in this case study in relation to what element of the CDE Framework enabled the team to assess whether capacity development strategies were effective. The data
collected suggested that this was the horizontal component\textsuperscript{c}. However, there was insufficient
data collected to draw definitive conclusions in this regard.

Thus, use of the CDE Framework on SIGHMP enabled the implementing team to identify
whether specific capacity development strategies were effective. The team then used this
information to improve the capacity development strategies they applied on SIGHMP.

\textbf{What is the impact of environmental factors on the program?} The impact environmental
factors had on progress and achievement of outcomes. Changes in the context that could
influence the future direction.

Application of the CDE Framework supported the team to identify environmental factors that
were affecting the outcomes. This was reflected in Progress Reports. For example, the final Four
Monthly Progress Report states\textsuperscript{c}:

The M&E assessment for this reporting period clearly identifies the extent of capacity
[development] in the different areas ... A number of common threads emerge such as
the detrimental effect on capacity building in the GHD because of staff shortages and the
absence of a Solomon Islands Government executive body to set direction and move
agreed initiatives forward.

However, while the Team Leader reported that use of the Framework did identify the
environmental factors that were influencing the outcome, he also indicated that he may have
known these factors independently of the monitoring\textsuperscript{c}. This is likely to be because of the Team
Leader’s strong relationship with counterparts and his intimate knowledge of the partner agency
and the environment in which it operated.

Thus on SIGHMP, the CDE Framework supported the team in identifying environmental factors
that were affecting the outcomes. However, it is unlikely that this increased their level of
awareness of these issues.

\textbf{What lessons have been learned?} Lessons that can be applied to improve this and future
initiatives.

The CDE Framework enabled identification of lessons learned that could be applied to SIGHMP
and other initiatives. However, the lessons stakeholders identified were restricted to those
relating to their perception of their responsibility.
Application of the CDE Framework to the Evaluation of Capacity Development Initiatives

The team’s focus for learning was on improving implementation of the Project to enable improvements in the organisation’s performance to be sustained when the Project finished. As a result, the lessons they identified as having emerged from use of the CDE Framework revolved around effective capacity development strategies. For example, as discussed previously, the Team Leader stated that the CDE Framework had enabled him to identify that capacity development strategies involving teamwork were more effective than strategies involving counterparts working individually. These lessons were then applied by the team to improve SIGHMP during the remainder of the Project. What is interesting is that these lessons emerged through the Framework despite the SIGHMP team having worked on the initiative for some years before the CDE Framework was introduced, and consequently having a deep understanding of the Project and its context.

The managing contractor representatives did not perceive that reporting on items such as lessons learned was part of their responsibilities because of their contractual relationship with AusAID. Consequently, they did not consider whether CDE Framework had identified lessons or lessons learned on SIGHMP.

In the last year of the Project when the CDE Framework was introduced, the AusAID manager’s focus was on the future. As a result, when the team reported lessons learned through use of the CDE Framework to AusAID, the AusAID manager reported that she used these lessons to draw attention to issues still present in Solomon Islands. This has a future focus rather than a focus on application to the current initiative.

From this, it can be seen that use of the CDE Framework supported the identification of lessons that could be applied to SIGMP and other initiatives. The focus of the lessons was dependent on the user’s perception of their responsibilities at that time.

Summary

Overall, the CDE Framework provided the information intended users required from evaluations of capacity development (Table 15).
Table 15. Summary of performance of CDE Framework on SIGHMP’s in providing information users require.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information users require</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>CDE Framework performance on SIGHMP in providing information users require</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What has changed?</td>
<td>Planned change in individual’s knowledge, skills and behaviour and the organisation. To a lesser extent, contribution and unintended change</td>
<td>✓ Change was identified through the clear specification of what was to be achieved (picture of success) and horizontal progression to outcomes. The previous approach had not identified change. ? Contribution of SIGHMP to change was clear. ? Data was not collected on identification of unintended outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What progress has been made toward sustainable achievement of the objective?</td>
<td>Has the original objective been achieved and if not, what progress has been made toward its achievement? Can the improvements in organisational performance be continued?</td>
<td>✓ Progress and lack of progress were identified through the results chain. ✓ The cause of lack of progress was often identified through the causality question. ✓ Enabled identification of partial achievement of the objective and strategies to support full achievement of the objective. This is through the focus on the four elements of capacity. ✓ CDE Framework provided information on sustainability of outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the capacity development strategy effective?</td>
<td>Did the capacity development strategy work?</td>
<td>✓ Identified whether capacity development strategies were or were not working. This was possibly through the results chain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the impact of environmental factors on the program?</td>
<td>The impact environmental factors had on progress and achievement of outcomes. Changes in the context that could influence the future direction</td>
<td>✓ The Framework identified environmental factors impacting outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What lessons have been learned?</td>
<td>Lessons that can be applied to improve this and future initiatives.</td>
<td>✓ Through the CDE Framework, the team identified lessons learned for application to SIGHMP and AusAID identified lessons for application to the future initiatives. The lessons learned were dependent on the user’s perception of their responsibility.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

This research is designed to determine whether the application of the CDE Framework assists the evaluation of capacity development initiatives, and if so, how the Framework does this. In terms of the SIGHMP case study, the use of the CDE Framework was found to meet the needs of the intended users; application of the Framework reflected most of the characteristics and provided the information intended users had specified. While the remaining criteria were met, it was not apparent whether this was a consequence of the CDE Framework or the quality of the evaluation.

On SIGHMP, users consistently considered the CDE Framework a significant improvement over the previous approach to M&E. This was because the CDE Framework was easier to understand and provided information that the previous M&E framework had not. This widespread agreement that the CDE Framework had produced better monitoring than occurred with the previous approach (or the approach used on the MoG), combined with team members having since applied the CDE Framework elsewhere, are strong indicators of the value the Framework contributes to M&E of capacity development.

Regardless of what information the Framework produced, the perceived relevance and use of this information was found to be a function of each stakeholder’s perception of their responsibilities on the Project. Thus, while information may have been produced, many user groups did not use the information unless this was a contractual or reporting requirement.

In addition to largely meeting the criteria identified in Phase 1, application of the CDE Framework provided further value through facilitating a breadth of other benefits. These benefits included improving stakeholder understanding of the Project and awareness of M&E, and supporting the outcomes and capacity development focus. These benefits were a consequence of clearly defining both what was to be achieved at an outcomes level and what was encompassed by the term ‘capacity development’. The application of the CDE Framework by the SIGHMP team rather than an external consultant produced timely results. As a partner explained, this was “really good. It is better than leaving it longer … [because] you can get disappointed and frustrated as you don’t know if improvement is actually happening, you don’t know if you’re on the right track”\textsuperscript{ccvii}. This approach also established ownership of the process among all advisers and partners. As a result, they were seen to come “up with a lot of suggestions and recommendations that were good, they didn’t hide issues and they spelt out
what was needed to be done and what was achievable. Combined with the timeliness of the findings, this ownership led to a high level of commitment to applying the findings. As a result, the team used the monitoring findings to the full extent possible.

Those involved did not identify any weaknesses in application of the CDE Framework on SIGHMP. This may be a consequence of the significant improvement it represented over the previous approach, or weaknesses not emerging in the short period through which it was applied (effectively less than 18 months).

In summary, SIGHMP was a small project for which the CDE Framework was introduced only in the last 18 months of operations. The implementation of M&E was essentially unfunded and the team’s M&E experience limited. In this context, application of the CDE Framework was found to assist SIGHMP’s evaluation of capacity development. The Framework provided most of the information and demonstrated the characteristics intended users required. Within the Framework, both the horizontal and vertical components and the causality question were seen as contributing to providing the required information. More broadly, the clarity achieved in defining what was to be achieved at an outcomes level and what was encompassed by the term ‘capacity development’ were also considered important. Finally, the CDE Framework provided a structured approach against which evaluation occurred, ensuring all areas were considered.
AUSTRALIA INDONESIA PARTNERSHIP DECENTRALISATION (AIPD)

Background.

Box 5. Overview of the Australia Indonesia Partnership – Decentralization (AIPD).


The Program

Australia Indonesia Partnership – Decentralization (AIPD) is a five-year AusAID funded program supporting improved service delivery through better resource allocation and management by government agencies at a provincial and district level. Support targets health, education and infrastructure services in the four provinces with the highest level of poverty in Indonesia. The program commenced on 1 January 2011, following on from a previous program. With a $61m budget, it is a large program, spread across a diverse, extended and expanding geographical area.

AIPD has adopted a systems approach and focuses on both the supply and demand side. Within this demand-supply framework, AIPD funds Government agencies and civil society organisations to implement a breadth of capacity development activities. The Government of Indonesia and civil society partners are responsible for managing activities and AIPD’s Management Support Team (MST) supports these partners to implement these activities. The MST is contracted to a company specialising in management of development assistance programs (Cardno Emerging Markets). The MST works under the direction of the AIPD Program Director (a senior direct employee of AusAID) who is responsible for the quality of the support provided.

The MST is also responsible for providing all support required to ensure:

Ongoing M&E is carried out to a high standard, including the conduct of ‘Evaluability Assessments’ in collaboration with partners, collection and analysis of baseline data, the commissioning of specific research/studies, the preparation of progress reports, and the effective exchange/dissemination of information about AIPD activities and outcomes.

Summary of AIPD’s Key Facts & Figures

Form of Aid: Program
$61m budget
5 years
Working with government and civil society in four provinces in Indonesia
2.6% budget allocated to internal M&E (excluding salary)
CDE Framework applied from activity design stage
As such, it is the MST who led the development of AIPD’s M&E System. However, the MST (with the exception of the M&E team), AusAID managers and partners each assessed their own level of M&E capacity as relatively low.

All those interviewed for this case study identified AIPD as a capacity development program. However, the design does not specifically refer to capacity development other than as an input. This suggests the Delivery Strategy intended capacity development to be seen as a means rather than an end in itself.

*Development of AIPD’s M&E System*

Taking into account the low M&E capacity of the MST and AusAID, AIPD’s M&E team sought to apply a simple M&E framework to conceptualise the change process and frame M&E at the output, outcome and impact levels. They decided to adopt the CDE Framework. Following this decision, AIPD’s M&E team led the development of their M&E System based on the CDE Framework.

Development of AIPD’s M&E System began six months before AIPD commenced and continued for almost 18 months. The development process included extensive consultation with the MST; AusAID; GoI partners at the national, provincial and district levels; the Program Coordinating Committee and other AusAID funded programs working in the same sector. These consultations were based on the CDE Framework and led to agreement that AIPD’s intermediate outcome was improved resource allocation and management.

From this, a suite of 19 Key Products were identified which were intended to contribute to improving resource allocation and management. Terms of Reference were prepared for each of these Key Products with the development of the Key Product defined as the output and its use as the Immediate Outcome. Indicators for each of output and outcome level were developed and a baseline covering these indicators completed in early 2012.

The consultations with the MST and AusAID also integrated workshops to raise awareness of M&E. These workshops occurred in parallel with AusAID commencing implementation of an internal, agency wide program to develop the M&E capacity of their staff. As part of this internal M&E capacity development program, AusAID also developed Standards for M&E that were introduced in late 2010 (AusAID, 2010). At that time, the M&E team made slight revisions to AIPD’s M&E System to align it with these Standards.

Initially AIPD did not introduce the vertical element (individual, entity, network and enabling environment) of the CDE Framework. This was not a deliberate decision, but by omission. The vertical element was introduced in early 2012.

AIPD had two full-time Indonesian experts, complemented by a part-time international M&E adviser during the first year of development. The national M&E Adviser is recognised as being extremely competent and an excellent communicator to both Indonesian and expatriate audiences. The words “When you have an extremely talented person, that makes all the difference” reflected the sentiment
expressed by many. The M&E Adviser is ably supported by a highly competent Management Information System (MIS) Specialist. The work she did has developed a MIS that meets the Programs needs.

**Methodology.**

The methodology used to collect and analyse data for each case study was discussed earlier in this chapter. Those elements of the methodology unique to AIPD are presented here.

Data was collected through interviews and documents for almost 2.5 years from the time when AIPD’s M&E Plan was finalised (November 2011). A total of 22 interviews were conducted (Table 16) with two of these interviews involving groups of two or four stakeholders. While English was a second language for many of the advisers and partners interviewed, their English language skills were high and consequently a translator was only required for two interviews. However, as English was a second language, most interviews were conducted in person rather than via Skype or telephone. Unfortunately, last minute schedule changes for some advisers and partners meant that they were not available for interviews. Combined with the need for face-to-face interviews, this limited the number of interviews conducted with advisers and those from partner agencies. Compounding this, some challenges subsequently emerged in the relationship between AIPD management and partner agencies during the second year of data collection that limited further data collection from partners.

**Table 16. Number of People Interviewed During Design and Implementation of AIPD’s M&E System.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>AusAID</th>
<th>Managing contractor</th>
<th>Team leader &amp; adviser</th>
<th>Sub-contractor</th>
<th>M&amp;E role</th>
<th>Partner agency</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total no. people</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of interviews</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Many of those interviewed for AIPD had difficulty in distinguishing between the CDE Framework, M&E and broader management issues. This was because the M&E had been fully integrated into implementation. Reflecting this approach, the CDE Framework had been used as the basis for refining the program logic, establishing the boundaries for activities to be included within the AIPD scope and designing these activities, in addition to forming the basis of the M&E. Consequently, with the exception of the M&E Adviser, almost none of those interviewed distinguished the CDE Framework from the M&E System. Accordingly, references to M&E System refer to the CDE Framework.

The following section presents the findings in relation to whether the application of the CDE Framework proved useful in the evaluation of AIPD.

Findings.

Overall, this research found that for the AIPD case study, the use of the CDE Framework benefited the Program’s M&E. This was largely due to the simple definition of output and the outcome combined with the use of a results chain, that together, clarified for all involved what AIPD would achieve. In particular, most of the information needs and characteristics intended users identified for a framework to evaluate capacity development (Chapter 4) were met. In addition, other benefits were identified, particularly around activity design. Many of those who used the framework have since applied it elsewhere.

Characteristics for a framework for evaluation of capacity development to be useful.

This section presents the findings in relation to how well application of the CDE Framework on AIPD demonstrated the characteristics intended users specified for a framework to evaluate capacity development (Chapter 4).

Easy to understand. Simplicity of language, concepts and presentation.

During the process of designing both activities funded by AIPD and AIPD’s M&E System, all those interviewed found the CDE Framework easy to understand; there were no language or concepts they found particularly difficult. One person commented, “It feels very easy and it all fits together, the pieces all fit together very simply. It is really good.” This reflects the tenor of many comments. The simplicity of the language is reflected in the M&E Adviser’s statement that the Framework: “Was easy to communicate to the team who had no experience with M&E or who were haunted by past experiences with M&E.”
Many of those interviewed recognized that previously, differentiating between the terms activity, output and outcomes was often difficult and unclear. However, the CDE Framework provided clarity in differentiating between outputs and each level of outcome through defining an output as a product and an immediate outcome as the use of the output. One evaluator found that this simple, but clear difference: “had people glued to their seats. It was almost like a hallelujah moment for those who had been involved in M&E training before, people grasped the concept really quickly.”

This clarity in definitions of output and each level of outcome was specifically identified as assisting to establish a common understanding of these terms across AusAID, partners, advisers and the management support team. This shared understanding of terms was illustrated in the examples stakeholders discussed during interviews of what would be monitored and when this would occur.

Once implementation of activities and the M&E System started, the Framework continued to be easy to understand. The key element contributing to this understanding appears to be the diagram used to capture the CDE Framework (Figure 4); this was well understood by all those interviewed. Those who had not been involved in the design phase noted that the diagram was clear and “a good summary to see how it all fits together.” Although the Framework was generally found to be easy to understand, a few of those who were not involved in the design phase and had not received training noted that the terminology used was different to their previous experience. Consequently, they had a small element of uncertainty about the specific meaning of the terms on AIPD. However, when the terms were explained during the interview, they found them simple. From this it is evident that despite the general clarity of the diagram, a clear description of each of the terms was required.

There was some confusion over the meaning of the term “enabling environment” which is part of the vertical component of the CDE Framework, based on UNDP’s (1997) fourth element of capacity development. This confusion flowed from the current focus of development assistance on climate change. This focus had led a small number of those interviewed to assume the term specifically referred to the natural environment and climate change.

Overall, users considered the CDE Framework was characterised by simplicity of language, concept and presentation; and consequently, found it easy to understand. The definitions of output and each level of outcome, and the diagram appear to be a major element of this.
Despite this simplicity, the terms must be explicitly defined due to the diversity of terminology in the sector.

**Easy to use.** *Practical rather than theoretical in implementation. Integrated into activity implementation rather than a separate function. Does not require M&E expertise to implement.*

All those involved in the application of the CDE Framework on AIPD found it easy to use. This was both in applying it to the design of activities and in M&E of activity implementation.

The CDE Framework formed the foundation of the M&E System, and was the base around which activities were designed. Consequently, the M&E is integrated into all aspects of design, implementation and management at a Program and individual activity level. As described by a senior manager:

> The whole program revolves around the logic of the M&E [the CDE Framework], we have taken an integrated approach to M&E. ... [it] ... is a system that is an integral part of the Program. The sharpness in the Program has been developed through the M&E. ... [The CDE Framework] has been there from the start.\textsuperscript{ccxvii}

The strong contrast of this to stakeholder's previous experience was expressed by many\textsuperscript{ccxviii}. A statement by an AusAID manager reflects this well: “it is very different on AIPD, on AIPD ... all of our design is based on the M&E Plan and the Program Delivery Strategy\textsuperscript{ccxix}.

Through this integrated approach, the Framework has been used to ensure that all activities contribute to a common end outcome, the terms of reference for activities are consistent with intended outcomes, indicators reflect these outcomes and there is agreement with partners and contractors about what will be done and what is to be achieved. The team believe this has led to better design of all activities because it forced them to “question whether an output will actually lead to the end of program outcome. If not, why is the output there?”\textsuperscript{ccx} The Framework has also been used to underpin contracts and contract negotiations. This is expected to increase the likelihood of achieving the planned immediate and intermediate outcomes\textsuperscript{ccxi}.

In leading the development of this integrated approach, the M&E Adviser was guided by a paper describing the CDE Framework (Kotvojs, 2009). Following this paper, he concluded that the CDE Framework had been easy to apply at the design stage. As a result of applying the Framework during the design, he found that the M&E System gave clarity in what should be evaluated, the required data and who should collect this data\textsuperscript{ccxii}.
The broader AIPD team also found the Framework easy to apply. The M&E Adviser attributed this to the Framework enabling the team “to easily identify the output when the term used was product rather than output. Then it was very easy for them to understand the ‘so what’ questions”. The ease of use of the AIPD’s M&E System was also confirmed by AusAID managers who described AIPD’s M&E System as “best practice across AusAID programs. Of the five programs that I have managed, only the AIPD M&E System is very clear, simple, and not giving me headaches. The advisers who are required to implement the System expressed similar perspectives. Part of this was a result of the Framework clarifying the evaluation questions that should be asked of a particular time. As a manager explained:

I look at [the Framework] and say ‘what is the appropriate question to ask at this point in time’. It enables me to say that we are not going to ask a high-level question because if we do ask it, we know that we will not have large results there, it is too soon.

AIDP did not initially use the vertical component of the CDE Framework – the four elements of the UNDP framework for capacity development. As implementation began, omission of this component was recognized as being “the missing part in what we have done” and this aspect was introduced. Those interviewed had different perceptions of the value of the vertical element of the Framework. For example an AusAID manager considered that it “may be trying to explain too much [in one] diagram. I think it is implicit and people realise that each of these four elements are there”. However, this contrasted the position expressed by others, including another AusAID manager who stated:

I particularly liked the way the model looks at the different levels, from the individual through to the environment. It does not consider just capacity as having a narrow focus on individuals but looks at all levels where your interventions are making a difference.

In some cases, the vertical component resulted in a systematic approach that ensured capacity development was planned rather than being something that “just happens”. Others, who had not previously considered networks and enabling environment when planning capacity development, suggested that these were now recognised as key elements of capacity development. While some also proposed that previous failures to consider networks and enabling environment might have constrained successful initiative outcomes and sustainability.
Part of users’ definition of ease of use was that a Framework for evaluating capacity development did not require M&E Specialist support to implement. Given the level of M&E expertise available, in this case, it is not possible to assess the extent to which M&E expertise was required for the successful application of the CDE Framework. A better basis for assessment may be in the experience of the sub-contractors who do not have M&E expertise. However, by the time data collection for this research was completed, the sub-contractors were only commencing implementation of the M&E System. Consequently, they believed it was too early to comment on ease of use of the Framework.

All those interviewed recognized this integrated approach was superior to that in the previous phase. This is reflected in the following statement by an AusAID manager who worked on AIPD and its predecessor:

> The M&E on AIPD is different to that on [the previous program]. On [the previous program] I do not remember it being a complete framework. I remember it having a very nice activity management system where inputs and outputs were tracked, but it was not tied together as a whole, it wasn’t cohesive... the sum of the parts didn’t equal the whole, it was just a heap of activities. The activities were not united by a single comprehensive M&E framework. Now that we have a much better M&E Framework for AIPD it is fair to make that criticism.

Overall, the CDE Framework was found to be easy to apply, at both the design and implementation stage. The application of the CDE Framework at the start of the Program was found to support integration of M&E into activity design, implementation and management on AIPD. However, it is not possible to draw conclusions from AIPD about the need for M&E expertise.

**Realistic resource requirements.** *Requirements for human and financial resources are not significant and the benefits outweigh the resource costs. Ideally, limited requirement for data.*

The resource requirements for application of CDE Framework were considered to be realistic by all user groups and the budget was lower than the guidelines specified by AusAID. In addition, many users believed that while the resource requirements for M&E were less than on other initiatives in which they had been involved, the M&E was of a higher quality and better supported quality design and initiative implementation.
AIPD’s M&E budget was within the AusAID guidelines (estimated at 5 to 7% of the initiative budget). This would indicate that the financial resources required to design and implement M&E based on the CDE Framework are reasonable. This view was supported by AusAID during activity design and implementation and is reflected in the typical comment from AusAID managers that AIPD “seemed quite reasonable in terms of the amount of resources that are used. It didn’t seem excessive, it seemed proportional to the size of Program. The same perspective was held by sub-contractors who considered the resource requirements for M&E on AIPD were the same as on other initiatives they implemented. Given that they assessed M&E on AIPD as an improvement on their previous practice, this would indicate that AIPD’s M&E had adopted a more efficient approach.

Likewise, the requirement for human resources was also considered realistic. This is reflected in users not raising concerns during the design phase about the time required to develop the M&E System and, once implementation of the M&E System began, stating that resource requirements were reasonable. This may be best demonstrated by a sub-contractor, on whom the resulting M&E System was effectively imposed, stating “The time that it takes to implement the M&E is not excessive”. Because the M&E was integrated into program implementation, M&E activities were conducted in conjunction with the other activities. This minimised any additional time required for M&E.

AIPD had also established very clear data requirements through the CDE Framework identifying needed, rather than desired, data. This achieved a clear understanding of data requirements before activities commenced. As a result of this clarification of data requirements and confirmation of data availability during the design of AIPD’s M&E System, the sub-contractors and managers agreed, “data is quite manageable; it is easy and quite reliable”. Thus, the CDE Framework has clearly supported limiting the requirements for data by clarifying data requirements and ensuring that only needed data was collected.

The M&E Adviser noted that use of the CDE Framework had also helped identify which of the many AIPD activities being implemented should be evaluated. This was significant since the main influence on M&E resources requirements for an initiative containing a large number of activities is the number of individual activities evaluated. Therefore, through clarifying the activities to be evaluated, the CDE Framework had minimised the human and financial resources required for AIPD M&E. However, the M&E Adviser went on to identify that other factors had a
greater influence on resource requirements for M&E than the Framework. The examples provided included AusAID’s introduction of the Adviser Remuneration Framework in 2012 and the management decision to establish baselines at all locations rather than at a sample of locations.

Overall, the use of the CDE Framework was characterised by realistic resource requirements in terms of human and financial resources and data required. This has primarily been achieved through the integration of the M&E into normal activity management, and clarifying data requirements and what should and should not be evaluated. However, factors other than the CDE Framework were more significant in determining the resource requirements for M&E.

**Rigour.** Supports implementation of rigorous, but not excessive, evaluations with honest findings. While quantitative analysis was often desired, this was not a consistent element of this criterion.

The CDE Framework contributed to development of an M&E System that was considered rigorous and produced honest findings. However, the CDE Framework was only one of the factors that contributed to establishment of a rigorous M&E System.

Few people considered rigour of evaluations during the design of the M&E System or the activities. Those who did, believed that AIPD’s M&E System (based on the CDE Framework) was rigorous. As implementation progressed, greater focus was given by users to rigour. Consequently, during implementation, AusAID managers and advisers had considered rigour and both had confidence in the rigour of the M&E on AIPD. For them, this had been demonstrated at the input and output level, but not yet at the outcome level as there had not been sufficient time to achieve outcomes. As a consequence of the confidence managers had in the M&E System, they placed great value on having a “very strong evidence based system” This enabled senior managers to present facts to refute “people coming here saying that they have feelings or thoughts about something.”

Many of those interviewed made limited direct comment on the role of the CDE Framework in supporting rigorous evaluations. In particular, those who directly collected and analysed the data for evaluations consistently attributed this rigour to the CDE Framework. For example, subcontractors reported that the CDE Framework had enabled provision of the precise evidence needed:
If we hadn’t had AIPD’s M&E framework, we couldn’t have identified the evidence that we needed to support our claims about success of the program. ... We couldn’t have made the claims about success without the Framework, but with the Framework, we can collect the data that we require to provide the evidence which supports our claims.

The honesty of the findings is reflected in conclusions that indicated the Program’s objectives would not be achieved, and that in West Papua, the capacity development strategies being applied were not effective. Following the CDE Framework supporting identification of honest findings, a range of factors influenced the honesty of reporting. For example, one manager indicated that having an AusAID Program Director provided them with greater ability to report on both “what went well, what didn’t go well and what we did wrong. ... [because] we won’t get smacked, unlike what would happen if a managing contractor wrote this.” Consequently, the CDE Framework was one of several contributing factors to the level of honesty in reported findings.

Overall, the CDE Framework facilitated M&E of an appropriate scale – providing the information required to inform decision making, but not being excessive. Importantly, stakeholders at all levels knew what data was required to effectively monitor and then evaluate activities. All stakeholder groups perceived the M&E System to be rigorous and the CDE Framework contributed to establishment of this rigorous M&E System.

**Versatility.** Applicable at different levels of a system; in different sectors and cultures; for different sized agencies; for initiatives of different size, implementation strategy and stage in project life-cycle; enable a variety of M&E methodologies.

As the M&E System and activities were being designed, AusAID managers found the CDE Framework to be versatile because it could be applied to all the capacity development activities funded by AIPD. These included initiatives supporting public financial management in the health, education and infrastructure sectors. As activity implementation occurred, the CDE Framework continued to be applicable to all AIPD capacity development activities and was able to respond to changes in strategic direction and variations between locations.

As AIPD was implemented, program staff were able to use the M&E to identify required changes to the Program design (and consequently M&E). The M&E demonstrated that many of the assumptions on which the Program was designed were not correct. It also flagged changes in AusAID and the Government of Indonesia priorities, which led to changes in the key products.
that the Program would support. As these changes were introduced, AusAID managers and the M&E Adviser concluded the M&E System had proved sufficiently flexible to incorporate these variations.

These changes also addressed a concern raised by a sub-contractor. He noted that the CDE Framework captured a linear process, whereas initiatives are implemented within a system and often adopt an iterative approach. At the time of interview, he was unsure whether the CDE Framework could reflect such changes. However, from the changes already described, in addition to changes made to the M&E System when it emerged that some indicators were unsuitable, the Framework was found to be able to reflect a more systems focused, iterative approach.

Overall, the versatility of the CDE Framework was well recognised by those interviewed. The general position held by those interviewed was reflected in the comment by one AusAID manager that “For capacity development types of activities, the Framework is very useful. It can be used for other types of programs as well.” This was supported by all stakeholder groups who indicated that they had, or would, apply the CDE Framework to other initiatives. For example, an M&E Adviser had already applied the Framework on three other programs in Indonesia and Philippines and a sub-contractor identified that because the Framework was easy to understand they had introduced it onto other initiatives that they implemented:

We are implementing this approach to M&E now on a USAID program that we have. Our implementing partner ... had no framework for M&E and several activities have been delayed. We used this M&E Framework to identify a timeline and enable anticipation of problems in achievement of the outcome. We also used the Framework to discuss with [our implementing partner] and agree how the delayed activities can be implemented and the outcomes achieved. We used it to identify and eliminate activities that do not contribute to the outcome.

This applicability was further expanded by a former Government of Indonesia planner who indicated it should also be adopted by the Government to improve planning and M&E. Thus, those who used the CDE Framework on AIPD considered it was versatile with broad applicability across a range of contexts.
The M&E Adviser believed that the versatility of the CDE Framework was also demonstrated by its suitability for use in a range of different philosophical approaches to M&E. This is demonstrated in his statement that:

I could apply the Framework using the evaluation theory that I think best for the program, but another person would do it differently and can still use the CDE Framework as reference. For example, participatory approach, or empowerment, or purely positivist views of evaluation – randomised control trial and quasi-experiments. The CDE Framework focuses on M&E of capacity development and outcomes. Therefore, as observed by a sub-contractor and an AusAID Manager, it does not include monitoring of inputs, the conduct of activities or achievement of payment milestones. This required additional monitoring at the input level.

The elements of the Framework that gave it versatility were identified as the clarity in definitions of outputs and immediate outcomes, establishing a clear logic from output to end outcome and supporting a breadth of capacity development elements, many of which were not usually considered. This was well demonstrated by a manager stating that:

I would use this Framework on other programs, I like the fact that it is a simple concept, the “if-then” is really clear and that an output is a product, and an outcome is how the product is used. This would be the key part I would use.

Overall, the CDE Framework was found to provide the versatility needed on AIPD, and more broadly to other initiatives. The Framework was successfully applied to initiatives across a range of sectors, at different stages in an activities life-cycle, and was considered suitable for use on other donor and Government funded initiatives. Thus, it met users’ criteria in regard to versatility within the Program.

**Use and usability.** Findings support use and are provided in a timely manner. Findings can be used to support the partner agency in planning and decision-making; the donor in program planning and implementation of other activities; and communication with stakeholders; and also meet the information needs of the program.

The CDE Framework supported use of evaluation findings at an implementation and strategic level through both design (usability) and the relevance of information provided. All those interviewed who were working at a strategic level commented that use of the CDE Framework
had led to the M&E providing information to support strategic decision-making. This contrasted their experience on previous programs where M&E provided only activity level information. As a consequence, they now depend on the information produced by the M&E System to inform their decision-making. Examples provided included using the:

- Program logic element to change the strategic approach so that the focus on what will improve service delivery, and consequently enhance the likelihood of achieving the end outcome, was increased.

- Vertical element of the Framework to identify and analyse capacity development issues and strategies to address these issues.

- Causality question to change the program design in one province and inform the participatory process of developing annual work plans.

- Time line and causality question to identify issues in relation to achievement of the objective and strategies to address these. An AusAID manager explained that:

  We used this Framework to show that by the end, we won’t be able to achieve the planned outcomes because of these delays. We were able to show this last year and discuss this. We have been using the Framework the whole time in our thinking. … Then we asked why, we analyse it and identify strategy to put us back on track. … The Framework has therefore been very useful.

The CDE Framework also supported clarity in communicating the initiative design and findings with stakeholders. The diagram was often used to explain the M&E System to external stakeholders. Managers reported that the timeframe had helped inform AusAID of realistic timeframes in which it could be expected to observe change. They had also used the question “why, why not” to provide a direction for discussing M&E findings with stakeholders. The clarity and consistency in definitions of output and outcome had enabled consistent communication and comparison across programming areas - not something previously possible.

Those interviewed commented that the CDE Framework improved reporting to AusAID. This was achieved through two means:

- The direction the Framework provided to the authors thinking: “I look at [the Framework] and say ‘what is the appropriate question to ask at this point in time?’” ; and
• Consistent activity level reporting that enabled consolidation of data and analysis across the Program.

This clarity also assisted to ensure that the requisite data was available to answer the questions required at that time. As one AusAID manager explained: “There is nothing worse than writing vague, mealy-mouthed reports because you don’t have any data. Being able to write real things because I have the data is great, it’s all due to the [M&E] system.”

Clearly, the approach taken on AIPD has been positive as AusAID managers have informed Team Leaders on several other AusAID programs that AIPD reports are considered to be of high quality and considered best practice.

From the examples provided by stakeholders, it is clear that the design of the CDE Framework facilitated use of findings. Thus, the CDE Framework met the usability criteria on AIPD.

The team have also applied the Framework in other ways. For example, managers on AIPD saw that the clarity established about the initiative was central to ensuring all activities contributed to a common end outcome, the terms of reference for activities were consistent with intended outcomes, indicators reflected these outcomes, and there was agreement with partners and contractors about what would be done and achieved. As noted earlier, the team believed this led to better design of all activities, and clarity in contracts and contract negotiations. Those interviewed reported that they expected this to increase the likelihood of achieving the planned immediate and intermediate outcomes.

The Framework’s simplicity enabled it to be used as the basis of training. This is reflected in the evaluator’s description that they used the CDE Framework:

for the purposes of M&E training and orientation of project staff and also with some Government of Indonesia staff. Everyone was struggling with the concept of capacity building and how to recognise and measure it. By presenting [the CDE Framework], we were able to get clarity and common understanding. Without exception, all training participants found it very, very useful and I guess informally adopted it into the thinking and approach.

The sub-contractors identified that the Framework had supported them to use M&E findings by providing information they needed to manage effectively the work they were contracted to perform and to achieve outputs and outcomes. For example, one stated that:
The M&E framework has helped us to be more focused in carrying out the Program ... It has also helped us to know whether the output will be achieved on time, we can anticipate this and prepare action in advanced to overcome this. It would be more difficult without the M&E framework.

Thus, the CDE Framework supported use of findings, including at a strategic level. This appears to result from the outcomes focus producing findings that informed decision-making and the overall design.

Summary

Overall, the CDE Framework demonstrated most of the characteristics intended users had desired in a framework for evaluation of capacity development (Table 17).

Questions the framework is to answer.

This section presents the findings in relation how well application of the CDE Framework on AIPD provided the information required by users (Chapter 4).

What has changed? Demonstration of planned change in individual’s knowledge, skills and behaviour and the organisation. To a lesser extent, contribution and unintended change.

Application of the CDE Framework on AIPD identified the occurrence of planned change in the knowledge, skills and behaviour of individuals. While some change in organisation and service delivery was identified, the end of data collection period was still too early to assess how well the Framework identified these changes. There was no evidence of whether the Framework identified unintended change.

All those interviewed during the M&E design process were confident that application of the CDE Framework would enable identification of the presence or absence of change in what individuals and organisations were able to do and also what they actually did as a result of AIPD. As the M&E was implemented, all user groups interviewed concluded that this expectation had proved true. They provided examples of changes the M&E identified in knowledge, skills and behaviour. These changes were generally at an output level as this was the level that would be expected at that stage in the Program.
Table 17. Summary of performance of CDE Framework on AIPD against characteristics users require.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>CDE Framework’s demonstration of the required characteristics on AIPD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easy to understand</td>
<td>Simplicity of language, concepts and presentation.</td>
<td>✓ Language, concepts and presentation found to be simple. Through the definition of output and outcome and the diagram.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ The term ‘enabling environment’ led to confusion with climate change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to use</td>
<td>Practical rather than theoretical in implementation. Integrated into activity implementation rather than a separate function. Does not require M&amp;E expertise to implement.</td>
<td>✓ All users found the CDE Framework easy to implement. The key elements were output and outcome definitions, and the key evaluation questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ The M&amp;E system and activity implementation were fully integrated. Application at the start of the initiative supported its integration into design and implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>? There is insufficient evidence to identify the extent to which M&amp;E expertise is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic Resource</td>
<td>Requirement for human, time and financial resources are not significant and the benefits outweigh the resource costs. Ideally, limited requirement for data.</td>
<td>✓ Realistic (or even reduced) resource requirements through integration into activity management and clarifying data requirements and which activities should/should not be evaluated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td>Supported rigorous, honest evaluation findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigour</td>
<td>Supports implementation of rigorous, but not excessive, evaluations with honest findings. While quantitative analysis was often desired, this was not a consistent element of this criterion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Versatility</td>
<td>Applicable at different levels of a system; in different sectors and cultures; for different sized agencies; for initiatives of different size, implementation strategy and stage in project life-cycle; enable a variety of M&amp;E methodologies.</td>
<td>✓ Applicable to all capacity development initiatives on AIPD and able to respond to changes in context, approach and priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Has been applied by AIPD team members to other initiatives in Indonesia and Philippines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not appropriate for monitoring achievement of inputs, activities or payment milestones (accountability).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>CDE Framework’s demonstration of the required characteristics on AIPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use and usability</td>
<td>Findings support use and are provided in a timely manner. Findings can be used to support the partner agency in planning and decision-making; the donor in program planning and implementation of other activities; and communication with stakeholders; and also meet the information needs of the program.</td>
<td>✓ Particularly at a strategic level. This appears to be through the provision of findings that inform decision-making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Supported communication of initiative and M&amp;E with stakeholders through clarity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>? There is no evidence of supporting partners planning or decision making.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, in a small number of cases, the M&E had identified organisational change and change in service delivery. The examples given by managers from AusAID or reported in the 2013 Mid-Year and End of Year Progress reports included the introduction and use of an E-procurement system in a province that had previously refused to introduce this system\(^{cclxxxiv}\). Other examples included changes in electronic processing of information, greater freedom of information and improvements in public financial management\(^{cclxxxv}\). This was confirmed in the 2013 Progress Report that included statements such as “This monitoring produced a deeper understanding of the way product use leads to organisational change”\(^{cclxxxvi}\).

These changes were identified through asking the evaluation question specified for each element of the horizontal results chain. As described by an AusAID manager, this component of the Framework “captures whether the product is used and applied and also at the outcomes level [it captures] the allocation [made by the Government] for basic services”\(^{nccloxxvii}\). In addition, advisers reported that the key evaluation questions were clear for all stakeholders from the beginning because they were specified in the CDE Framework. They believed this clarity from the commencement of the Program was an important element in identifying change. This is reflected in an adviser’s statement that:

Yes of course [the M&E system identifies the changes]. In the first year, questions may be if the activity conducted is meeting the needs. In year two, the question may be if the product is being used or not. This is the critical one. If yes, then we move to questioning whether it will produce a change in behaviour or the system. So maybe in year three, it will vary between programs, we will look for this. If the answer is no, then we have to ask why not. The government already knows that we will ask these questions of them.
because we have already identified all questions and the targets. It is important that we make it clear from the beginning.\textsuperscript{cclxxxviii}

While the CDE Framework clearly identified change, there was less clarity about the extent to which it identified AIPD’s contribution to this change\textsuperscript{cclxxxix}. This was a result of the large number of donors working in this sector\textsuperscript{ccxc} and the difficulty in separating the contribution of each. Consequently, many of those who gave examples of changes identified by the M&E System were less confident as to whether the AIPD contribution could be clearly argued. For example, an AusAID manager stated: “I’m ... not sure that we will know about contribution, maybe change will happen and we did stuff, but there isn’t actually any relationship. Who knows if it would have happened without us?”\textsuperscript{ccxcii}

This contrasted with the perspective of others who were confident that the contribution of AIPD to the identified changes was clear\textsuperscript{ccxcii}. For example, a small number of AusAID managers and advisers\textsuperscript{ccxciii} interviewed believed that it was “difficult to see how the contribution occurs, but with the data, this analysis will be easier\textsuperscript{ccxciv}. These users viewed the mechanism to identify contribution as the program logic underpinning the CDE Framework\textsuperscript{ccxcv}. However, others suggested that the causality question assisted in determining contribution. This is reflected in the statement by an adviser that “I like the ‘if not, why not’. It is the so what; because these can be contributing factors which influence the outcomes\textsuperscript{ccxcvi}. Regardless of whether determination of contribution is facilitated by the CDE Framework, an adviser noted that the CDE Framework encouraged them to consider contribution; something they had not previously done\textsuperscript{ccxcvii}. The consideration of contribution should be considered a positive step.

Thus, application of the CDE Framework identified change in individuals, the organisation and service delivery on AIPD. This was through the horizontal component of the CDE Framework. There is evidence that the CDE Framework’s support to establish a clear program logic and activity design, along with the causality question, may support identification of contribution on AIPD. However, the data collection period did not encompass enough of the program life cycle to have certainty on the extent to which the CDE Framework supported assessment of contribution. In addition, there was no evidence at this stage of whether unintended change is identified through use of the CDE Framework.
What progress has been made toward sustainable achievement of the objective? Has the original objective been achieved and if not, what progress has been made toward its achievement? Can the improvements in organisational performance be continued?

All those interviewed agreed that the CDE Framework allowed them to demonstrate progress toward the objective. They provided specific examples of achievement of output and immediate outcomes, which combined, were considered progress toward higher-level outcomes and the objective. Perhaps more importantly, those interviewed reported that the Framework also clearly identified where progress had not occurred. For example, an AusAID manager said that:

We used this Framework to show that by the end, we will not be able to achieve the planned outcomes ... We have been using the Framework the whole time in our thinking. We actually have a section in our report which says are we now where we said that we would be, both at the start of the program and six months ago. Basically, we use this Framework for identifying this.

This ability to identify where progress had not occurred was considered by many managers to be a unique characteristic of the CDE Framework. These managers consistently made statements that in their previous experience, they “haven’t seen any programs that have done this [monitor progress toward the objective] properly yet.” As a result, effective monitoring of progress towards the objective was seen as a major strength of the CDE Framework.

In addition, all bar one manager were confident that the M&E System provided evidence to determine whether the outcomes would be sustainable. This is reflected in statements such as: “From the M&E you can see areas where sustainability is likely ... areas where it is more a ‘there may be’, and others where sustainability will probably not occur under the existing administration.” This was also considered a strength of the Framework.

Those interviewed found that progress towards objectives was demonstrated through the time line combined with the baseline study, and key indicators defined for all outcome levels. The importance of having several outcome levels is reflected in an AusAID manager’s statement that progress was demonstrated through: “… the stages of the Framework, it doesn’t only have input, output and outcome, but it breaks it down into immediate, intermediate and end outcomes and analyses it.” In addition, because sustainability of outcomes was seen as important on AIPD, most of those interviewed had considered whether the M&E System would
provide this information. They had a high degree of confidence that the M&E would provide the information needed. Information to identify whether the outcomes would be sustained was a result of the CDE Framework’s focus on changes at an organisational level rather than only at an individual level, combined with the causality question. In particular, several interviewees, noted that the causality question supported a proactive approach to sustainability. For example, an interviewee from a partner agency also emphasised that the approach taken “reminds us that we need to pay attention to the issue of sustainability”.

In summary, the CDE Framework encouraged a focus on sustainability and enabled identification of both progress and lack of progress on AIPD. Significantly, the Framework enabled management to identify that the objective would not be achieved and implement a strategy to address this. Information on progress was obtained through the horizontal component of the Framework combined with the use of indicators, while information on sustainability flowed from the clear specification of outputs and outcomes at an organisational level.

**Was the capacity development strategy effective? Did the capacity development strategy work?**

Application of the CDE Framework identified variations in the effectiveness of capacity development strategies between locations. During the design of the M&E System, only a small number of those interviewed expressed an opinion on the CDE Framework’s ability to provide information that would enable managers to determine the effectiveness of a specific capacity development strategy. However, as implementation of AIPD progressed, the level of confidence in the M&E’s ability to identify the effectiveness of different capacity development strategies grew. As a result, within a year of implementation of the M&E System, AusAID and other managers all identified that the M&E system captured “information about which [capacity development] approaches work”. From this information, an AusAID manager stated, “We saw that providing the same key product [to each province] was not working. ... from the M&E report, we were able to see that we need to provide different support to different regions”.

Thus, implementation of the M&E System enabled provincial differences in effectiveness of specific capacity development strategies to be identified and addressed. The team is confident that data collected through the CDE Framework will enable a broader assessment of effectiveness of different capacity development strategies.
What is the impact of environmental factors on the program? The impact environmental factors had on progress and achievement of outcomes. Changes in the context that could influence the future direction.

There was significant evidence that use of the CDE Framework during the activity design process encouraged consideration of the context in which AIPD was operating. During the activity-planning period, the CDE Framework encouraged identification of environmental factors that may influence the outcomes. For example, an adviser stated that as a consequence of the CDE Framework “we look at external factors that influence the result of each stage ... and we include what we will do to address these.” Team members identified that they had not previously considered this during activity design. Because this was a new practice, a small number of those interviewed also found identifying these potential factors a challenge.

As activity implementation commenced, team members were confident that “the M&E System will show us some of the things in the enabling environment that have influenced the program outcomes.” Many AusAID managers provided examples of environmental factors that influenced the outcomes. Of these, perhaps the most significant were the factors identified as influencing progress in Papua. As a result, “AIPD used the findings from the M&E to change the design for West Papua and also the work planned for the next year.” The identification of these factors was attributed to the CDE Framework. In particular, for many, the recognition of environmental factors influencing AIPD outcomes was through application of the causality question in the CDE Framework. Team members found this encouraged progressive analysis of factors that either contributed to, or hindered, achievement of outcomes. As one adviser explained:

I like the ‘if not, why not?’ It is the ‘so what?’ Because these can be the contributing factors which influence the outcomes. This helps us already be prepared for things that may stop us achieving the end outcome. It also means that the evaluation can be put in stages, we can ask ‘if not, why not?’ at each level. It stimulates me to think behind this.

In summary, the CDE Framework encouraged consideration of environmental factors that influence the activity outcomes during the design of an activity and during implementation through application of the causality question at each level.
**What lessons have been learned?** Lessons that can be applied to improve this and future initiatives.

The importance of the M&E System in identifying lessons learned was strongly emphasised on AIPD. This was reflected in the AIPD M&E Operational Guidelines for Sub-contractors which specified that one of the three questions the M&E Framework assisted to answer was “Can we do it better?” The Guidelines explained that this “question deals with continuous improvement and lessons learned”.  

With this emphasis in place from the start of the program, it is not surprising that all those interviewed during the activity design period were confident that the M&E System would identify lessons that could be applied to AIPD and other programs. For example, in response to the question “Will the M&E System identify lessons learned that can be applied to AIPD and other programs?”, the typical response was reflected by an AusAID manager’s reply: “Absolutely yes. It will tell us that through the regular reporting cycle. This also reflected the position of counterpart’s position, that the M&E would show “positive and negative lessons learned … and not just at the end of an activity, but along the way so we can have responses in place as we go”. All managers interviewed saw this as an important element of AIPD’s M&E System.

As the M&E System was implemented, this confidence proved well placed; lessons that could be applied to AIPD and other initiatives were identified. However, because of the level of integration of M&E within all activities, it was not always clear to those interviewed whether this was a consequence of the M&E System. For example, a manager stated that:

> Whether we see lessons learned through the M&E is more difficult. … the lessons don’t all come from the M&E. For example, realizing that we shouldn’t be doing all of the activities in every district didn’t really come from the M&E, other than seeing from it that we were not achieving what we should be and then looking at why this was.

In another case, an adviser stated, “The M&E Framework has not shown us the lessons learned. We will need to use other M&E tools … [to] capture additional information”. However, he indicated that this additional information was progress data from the M&E System. In both cases, these responses indicate that the M&E System did identify the ‘missing’ information that generated lessons. However, while neither manager considered the M&E System to have identified lessons learned, clearly from the last part of both statements this information was
from the M&E System. In addition, it is clear that the CDE Framework had contributed through the horizontal results chain and the causality question.

The inability to distinguish what was, and was not, part of the M&E System demonstrated by these comments, was typical of many of those interviewed. This confusion among team members over the Framework’s contribution to identifying lessons was a consequence of the extent of integration of M&E within AIPD; few differentiated M&E. For example, a typical comment is reflected in an AusAID manager’s statement when explaining how lessons were identified: “I am not sure if this is part of the M&E System or not”\textsuperscript{cccxxvii}.

While team members may have had difficulty in determining the contribution of the CDE Framework to identification of lessons learned; the Framework’s contribution was clearly recognized in AIPD’s Program Reports. For example, the 2013 Mid-Year State of Program Report and 2013 Progress Report each identified a number of technical and management lessons that had been learned and set out how these lessons would be applied to AIPD\textsuperscript{cccxxix}. Many of these lessons were specifically attributed to the CDE Framework, in particular those relating to achievement of the End of Program Outcome within the Program life.

In all cases, the examples of lessons focused on improving AIPD outcomes. No one interviewed raised the relevance of the lessons to other initiatives or future phases. This may be a consequence of the research period being during the first half of the initiative’s life; a period where AusAID managers, advisers and partners were focused on this initiative and not considering the future or other initiatives.

In summary, the CDE Framework contributed to identification of lessons that were applicable to AIPD but stakeholders did not consider their external applicability. While these lessons were identified through highlighting areas of good and poor progress and then asking why or why not this was achieved – a core part of the CDE Framework – few attributed this to the CDE Framework. This was due to the high level of integration of the M&E into Program implementation.

\textit{Summary.}

Overall, the CDE Framework was found to support answering many of the questions users want evaluations of capacity development to answer (Table 18). However, at this stage there is no
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evidence as to whether the Framework will support identification of contribution or lessons learned for external application.

Table 18. CDE Framework performance on AIPD in providing information users require.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information required</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>CDE Framework performance on AIPD in providing information users require</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What has changed?</td>
<td>Planned change in individual’s knowledge, skills and behaviour and the organisation. To a lesser extent, contribution and unintended change</td>
<td>✓ Change at output level identified. Limited organisational change and change in service delivery identified because it was too early to see significant change at these levels. Change demonstrated through the horizontal component of the Framework. ? Too early to identify contribution, but results chain and the causality question are believed to enable this. ? No evidence whether unintended change is identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What progress has been made toward sustainable achievement of the objective?</td>
<td>Has the original objective been achieved and if not, what progress has been made toward its achievement? Can the improvements in organisational performance be continued?</td>
<td>✓ Enabled early identification that the objective was unlikely to be achieved and subsequently that it would not be achieved. ✓ Both progress and lack of progress were identified. Progress identified through the timeline, results chain and comparing indicators with the baseline. ✓ The CDE Framework encouraged a focus on sustainability. Information on sustainability was provided through the clear specification of outputs and outcomes at an organisational level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the capacity development strategy effective?</td>
<td>Did the capacity development strategy work?</td>
<td>✓ Differences in effectiveness of capacity development strategies were identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the impact of environmental factors on the program?</td>
<td>The impact environmental factors had on progress and achievement of outcomes. Changes in the context that could influence the future direction.</td>
<td>✓ The Framework encouraged consideration of environmental factors at the design. It also contributed to identifying environmental factors impacting the program during implementation. This was through the causality question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What lessons have been learned?</td>
<td>Lessons that can be applied to improve this and future initiatives.</td>
<td>✓ Lessons learned for application to this initiative were identified. Lessons identified through progress and then asking the causality question. ? No evidence of consideration of lessons for application to other initiatives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion.

This research was designed to determine whether the application of the CDE Framework assists the evaluation of capacity development initiatives, and if so, how the Framework does this. The use of the CDE Framework was found to assist the M&E on AIPD. This is reflected in the M&E providing the information required by intended users, the breadth of benefits attributed to use of the CDE Framework, and all involved in AIPD’s previous phase stating that the use of the CDE Framework had improved M&E. Similarly, the value of the Framework was also supported by the fact that some intended users working on AIPD had already applied the Framework to initiatives funded by other donors. Other users stated that they would apply it to future initiatives. In addition, the Framework also met most of the criteria intended users had specified for assessing the utility of a framework to evaluate capacity development.

The value of the Framework on AIPD came from the simple definition of output and the outcome combined with the use of the horizontal results chain and the causality question. Together, these elements of the Framework provided clarity about what the Program would achieve and how activities related to this. This helped improve the quality of activity designs and ensured that they all contributed to the planned outcome. In addition, consideration of the timeframe and risk was also seen as a benefit during the design stage. However, consideration of risk does not appear to have added value during implementation, and the anticipated benefit of having a clear timeframe did not eventuate as senior donor managers subsequently ignored the agreed timeframe. Many, if not all of the benefits in this case are a consequence of using the CDE Framework during design activities. It is uncertain how many of these benefits would have been gained had the Framework been introduced at a later stage. In addition, inclusion of the four elements of capacity development does not appear to have added significant value to AIPD during implementation.

Many of the factors that contributed to the success of M&E on AIPD reflect good evaluation practice. For example, planning M&E concurrently with design of activities is good practice, though breached more often than met, and rarely undertaken to the level that occurred on AIPD. However, this integrated approach was supported by the simplicity of the CDE Framework. In addition, adequate resource allocation for M&E as occurred on AIPD is also good practice, but again, something that in practice, often does not occur. Thus, the application of good practice, may also have contributed to the M&E outcomes.
Most of the issues raised about M&E were related to misunderstandings of the Framework rather than inherent weaknesses in the Framework. For example, a concern that the Framework only used quantitative indicators is a function of the choice of indicators rather than an explicit requirement of this Framework. Likewise, the concern that it reflected a linear rather than systems approach ignores the intent of the causality question and reflects a general criticism of program logic: while program logic is intended to be flexible, it is often perceived as inflexible due to lack of understanding among users. Thus, these issues with M&E on AIPD are not specific to the CDE Framework, but broader challenges for M&E.

A further weakness identified was the failure of the CDE Framework to identify champions. However, while the significance of working through champions is well recognised (for example, WB, 2010), it would be debatable as to whether identification of champions is the role of M&E or broader program management. This lack of differentiation between M&E and program management may indicate the level to which the M&E has been integrated into normal program management.

In addition, this case study showed that some in management failed to recognise that the Framework did not monitor accountability issues. This is because the CDE Framework was specifically designed to M&E development of capacity and is thus outcomes, rather than activity and input, focused. Consequently, the need for additional monitoring to meet program accountability requirements may need to be addressed with management.

In summary, application of the CDE Framework was found to assist the evaluation of capacity development on AIPD. This primarily occurred as a result of clearly defining outputs and outcomes, clarifying the program logic and explicitly including the causality question.
AUSTRALIA INDONESIA PARTNERSHIP ECONOMIC GOVERNANCE (AIPEG)

Background.

Box 6. Overview of the Australia Indonesia Partnership –Economic Governance (AIPEG).
(Source: AIPEG 2010 a & b, 2012; AusAID, 2009a & 2011; Bost 2012a & b; Dawson, 2009; Winter, Edwards & Triaswati, 2011)

The Facility

The Australia Indonesia Partnership for Economic Governance (AIPEG) Facility is a $66 million AusAID funded Facility that commenced in December 2009. The Design (AusAID, 2009a, p. iv) described a “Facility” as a “form of aid, in which high level objectives are mutually agreed upon with GoI partners and then flexible planning and responsiveness to emerging priorities enables participants to undertake a range of activities”. Facility’s are designed to promote long term partnerships or influence policy rather than achieve a substantial change in institutional performance. Thus, change will occur at the activity level but not at an organisational level. Therefore, M&E at the Facility level should be aimed at changes in relationships and policy, complemented by M&E of changes in capacity and performance at the activity level (Dawson, 2009).

This Facility was designed with a six-year life, including a planned review after three years to support a formal decision whether to proceed to the second half of the Facility. AIPEG’s goal is “To improve the quality of the Government of Indonesia’s economic management and through this contribute to broad based growth and poverty reduction”.

AIPEG was designed to build on previous support delivered since the late 1990s through three phases of the Indonesia-Australia Technical Assistance Management Facility for Economic Governance (TAMF). The previous phases had only provided technical assistance, were output focussed, and did not address capacity development. However, in response to the Government of Indonesia’s request that AIPEG focus on developing organisational capacity, AIPEG’s objective was established as: “To strengthen governmental capability for policy formulation, coordination and implementation in areas affecting the national budget and macroeconomic performance”. Thus, AIPEG was designed as a capacity development initiative.

Summary of AIPEG’s Key Facts & Figures

Form of Aid: Facility
$66m budget
6 year life
1 full time relatively inexperienced M&E Officer
1 part time experienced M&E Adviser
1 part time MSC Officer
3 Sub-Facilities working with Government of Indonesia central agencies
2.8% budget allocated to internal M&E
M&E commenced 16 months after Facility
To achieve this, AIPEG operates through a series of sub-facilities. During the fieldwork, there were three sub-facilities each supporting a central government agency (Directorate General Tax, Bapepam-LK, and the Ministry of Trade) through institutional strengthening and policy advice on tax administration reform, debt management, financial system stability and international trade. Each Sub-facility had its own goal and objective that were designed to contribute to the Facility wide objective. Each Sub-facility team is led by a Lead Adviser. Many of the advisers in each Sub-facility continued from TAMF to AIPEG. While this created continuity, combined with drawing AIPD advisers from Australian government agencies, it resulted in a high proportion of team members having a limited understanding of design, capacity development or M&E. Few were experienced in participatory processes or recognised the significance in the shift from a technical advice to a capacity development role.

Governance of AIPEG was relatively complex. An Advisory Board comprising highly skilled Indonesian economic governance specialists provided strategic advice. This Board was co-chaired by AusAID and GoI senior officials. Indonesian and Australian senior officials took advice from the Advisory Board to make decisions regarding plans, allocations and selection of individual activities. Norton Rose was appointed as the managing contractor to support activities through a management support team (MST) and contribute specialists to support capacity development. The MST was responsible for supporting partner agencies design and implement quality activities, cross-Facility coordination and relationship management.

M&E was to be completed by an external Facility Evaluation Team (FET) making periodic detailed assessments of each Sub-facility and addressing three specified questions at the Sub-facility and Facility level. The FET model had been used in TAMF. The MST’s responsibility regarding M&E was to support partner agencies undertaking M&E and conduct “random triangulation” of partners ‘and consultants’ perspectives on the “quality of activity processes and progress in terms of the delivery of outputs and achievement of objectives” at an activity level (AusAID, 2009a, p. 30). While it was recognised this might change when the Facility commenced, the MST was provided no resources for M&E. There was also no reporting on monitoring required from the MST other than through the six-monthly Facility Review.

Development of AIPEG’s M&E System

As the Design did not resource internal M&E, AIPEG’s managing contractor was required to obtain AusAID approval for appointment of M&E support to develop an internal M&E System. This process delayed commencement of development of the Facility’s M&E System by six months. Once a part-time international M&E Adviser was appointed, development of the system commenced. The system was designed through an initial one week Evaluability Assessment that included document review and stakeholder consultation. Following AusAID approval of this document, the M&E Plan was prepared approximately eight months after AIPEG commencement. The preparation process involved two weeks input from the M&E Adviser to consult with stakeholders and prepare the Plan. AIPEG’s internal M&E is
based on the Facility Design Document, AusAID’s M&E Standards and AusAID’s Economic Governance Sector Interim Strategy. AusAID’s Economic Governance Sector Interim Strategy recognises that evaluation against outcomes must take a longer-term (5-10 year) perspective however, it has remained in draft format throughout the research period.

The M&E Plan was approved by AusAID approximately five months later, enabling recruitment and appointment of a full-time national M&E Officer. This process commenced immediately and the M&E Officer commenced approximately 15 months after the AIPEG began. Consequently, activity design commenced over a year before the M&E Plan was implemented and while there was some training for advisers, senior managers of the Facility did not participate in this and there was limited follow-up. The M&E System was included in the induction for all new advisers.

The M&E Plan was based on the CDE Framework. This framework for evaluation of capacity development was selected because it was expected to support the team focus on capacity development at the Sub-facility level – a new approach for all those working at the Sub-facility level. The M&E Adviser believed that it would assist teams to consider a variety of capacity development strategies in the design and take a more outcomes focus.

Given the number of activities supported by AIPEG, the Plan specified that all capacity development activities with a value of more than $50,000 would be evaluated. Over time, a single evaluation would be conducted for all activities contributing to the same immediate or intermediate outcome. To enable this, the M&E Plan required all initiatives supporting capacity development to develop a Results Chain (RiC) as part of the activity design. This RiC was the same as the CDE Framework. An evaluation framework setting out data sources, and data collection and analysis methods was developed for each evaluation. The M&E expertise was provided during design of the M&E System, and planning and analysis of each evaluation. Beyond this, the CDE Framework was applied on AIPEG without extensive support from an expert M&E Adviser. Between inputs from the part-time M&E Adviser, the Senior Design Adviser and M&E Officer (both of whom had a limited knowledge of M&E) supported the team in applying the CDE Framework. After about 18 months, the Senior Design Adviser decided to use only the RiC (CDE Framework) and not to continue to document the evaluation framework in response to concerns about the amount of time this required.

Within 18 months of implementation of the M&E Plan, four internal activity evaluations (where activities did not contribute to common outcomes) and three outcome level evaluations (where the activities contributed to a common outcome) had occurred and five baselines had been developed using the CDE Framework. Evaluation reports were produced for each evaluation. Where a Sub-Facility strongly disagreed with the findings, reports were slow to be finalised. Senior management was not involved in providing feedback to Sub-Facility teams until the final evaluation.
Three internal reviews of the M&E System were conducted during the first 2.5 years of its implementation. The findings from these reviews were used to improve implementation of the M&E. An independent Mid-Term Review of the Facility was conducted after approximately 2.5 years to determine whether the Facility should proceed to Phase 2. This Review also considered the M&E. Following the decision to proceed with Phase 2, further independent review of the M&E system was conducted to make recommendations about the approach to M&E in Phase 2. In addition, the FET commented on AIPEG’s internal M&E in one of their evaluations.

**Methodology.**

The methodology used to collect and analyse data for each case study was discussed earlier in this chapter. Those characteristics unique to AIPEG are briefly presented here.

Data was collected from the time implementation of the M&E Plan commenced (May 2011) for almost 2.5 years through interviews and documents. Initial interviews related to applying the CDE Framework to the process of designing the M&E System and activities. Subsequent interviews considered applying the CDE Framework to evaluations. A total of 27 interviews were conducted (Table 19). Only two of these interviews involved groups of two users – both from the same user group. While English was a second language for many of those interviewed, translators were not required.

<p>| Table 19. Number of people Interviewed during design and implementation of AIPEG’s M&amp;E System. |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>AusAID</th>
<th>Managing contractor</th>
<th>Team Leader &amp; adviser</th>
<th>M&amp;E role</th>
<th>Partner agency</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total no. people</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. interviews</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of partners interviewed is limited. This was a consequence of AusAID undertaking a series of other reviews (several were unrelated to AIPEG) during this period which required their team to interview partner agency managers. As a result of this, managers from partner agencies
expressed frustration at the number of times they were being interviewed for what they believed was AIPEG. This created concern among the Lead Advisers that additional interviews may adversely affect partner relationships and had the potential to limit the AIPEG M&E team’s ability to collect data for their internal M&E. For this reason, AIPEG requested that a number of interviews with partners be delayed. Due to what seemed to be an almost continual series of reviews, many interviews for this research with partners did not occur.

In addition to interviews, data was collected from a range of documents (Appendix F). These included external documents (the Facility Design Document, several Facility Evaluation Team’s Performance Assessment and Evaluation Reports, the independent review of AIPEG’s M&E system and the Independent Progress Report) and internal documents (the M&E Plan and associated documents, evaluation reports and two internal reviews of the M&E system).

With the exception of the M&E team, those interviewed were not directly familiar with the term “CDE Framework”. This is because the terminology used on AIPEG was the Results Chain (RiC). As the RiC is the CDE Framework, when reading interviews, any reference to RiC or M&E Framework should be read as a reference to the CDE Framework.

The researcher was also the M&E Adviser for this Facility. To minimise the impact of this on the research, the M&E Adviser’s perspective was not included. Consequently, all quotes from the M&E team used in this research are from other members of AIPEG’s M&E team. Other strategies to minimise the impact of the researcher being the M&E Adviser on the findings were presented in Chapter 3.

The following section presents the findings in relation to whether the application of the CDE Framework assisted the evaluation of AIPEG.

**Findings.**

Overall, this research found that for the AIPEG case study, the use of the CDE Framework benefited the Facility’s M&E. This was largely due to the simple definition of output and the outcome combined with the use of a results chain that together, clarified for all involved what AIPEG would achieve. The Framework was found to meet most of the information needs and characteristics intended users had specified for assessing the utility of a framework to evaluate capacity development (Chapter 4). In addition, a range of other benefits (particularly around
activity design) were identified and a number of those who used the Framework have already applied the Framework elsewhere.

**Criteria for a framework for evaluation of capacity development to be useful.**

This section presents the findings in relation to how well application of the CDE Framework on AIPEG demonstrated the characteristics intended users required.

**Easy to understand: Simplicity of language, concepts and presentation.**

The CDE Framework was found to be easy to understand when applied on AIPEG by both those who supported M&E and those who did not see the value of M&E. In addition, a number of those interviewed also commented positively on its brevity.

During application of the CDE Framework to support activity design and implementation, advisers consistently commented that the Framework was easy to understand. Comments included that it was “straight forward”, “easy to understand and explain” and that “the words in the ... Framework are simple”. Likewise, AusAID managers found the Framework easy to understand and considered it “a strength to have a clear framework that should be built into the activity and the Sub-facility”. Partner agency managers considered the CDE Framework “a logical approach ... By having this in place we can see what should be achieved and what has been done”. For them, it was “exactly what [we are] looking for.

For all those interviewed, there was a significant difference between using the CDE Framework and their previous experience of M&E. This was reflected in this adviser’s statement, “I think the AIPEG M&E is the first [M&E] document that I have that is easy to understand” which contrasted her “previous experience at other development projects [where] ... I have seen the M&E as complex, difficult and not really clear to understand. Despite this simplicity, a highly experienced external independent evaluator stated that the Framework was not an “oversimplification”.

Perhaps the best reflection of both the conceptual clarity and ease of use of the CDE Framework was the number of managers and advisers who stated that they would apply the CDE Framework in the future to other programs. This is clearly revealed in the words of a manager who had not initially seen the value in M&E:
I would use the M&E Framework again. I have read a lot [on another M&E framework since] and ... I think our approach is more logical, easier to understand, simpler and more useful than the others I have seen\textsuperscript{cxxxix}.

A small number of those interviewed concluded that the vertical component, the four elements of capacity development as defined by the UNDP (1997), “helps clarify the planning, it makes sure these elements are included and it makes it clear\textsuperscript{ccxxi}. However initially, this aspect of the Framework was generally poorly understood\textsuperscript{ccxli}. For example, several AusAID managers and an adviser identified that while they found the Framework “conceptually very clear”, initially they did not understand the vertical component of the Framework and why this was included\textsuperscript{ccxlii}. Another adviser did not understand the meaning of the terms organisation and enabling environment in relation to capacity development\textsuperscript{ccxliii}. As the Facility progressed those interviewed came to “understand the framework that we used on AIPEG. It all seemed really straightforward once I sat down and read it”\textsuperscript{ccxliv}. Despite this, as a result of the initial lack of understanding of the vertical component, these four elements of capacity development were not considered by most of the team or used in the design process\textsuperscript{ccxlv}. Further, they were not included in AIPEG’s capacity development strategy, which focused on the individual and to a lesser extent, the organisational level, but did not consider networks or the enabling environment. To overcome the challenges caused by poor understanding of the vertical element of the Framework, but gain the identified benefits of this element, one adviser who initially struggled to understand these concepts suggested that:

It would have been better to use a simpler form at the earlier stage and then expand. It would have been easier if we had just used the [outputs and levels of outcomes] and not the four [capacity development elements]\textsuperscript{ccxlvi}.

In summary, all user groups found the horizontal component of the CDE Framework easy to understand when applied to support activity design and implementation. This was primarily due to the definitions of outputs and outcomes. However, a number of people initially had difficulty in understanding the concept conveyed in the vertical dimension of the Framework.

\textbf{Easy to use: Practical rather than theoretical in implementation. Integrated into activity implementation rather than a separate function. Does not require M&E expertise to implement.}

The Framework itself was seen as relatively simple to use by advisers, AusAID, the M&E team and external evaluators\textsuperscript{ccxlvi}. This was reflected by the statement from an adviser with no
previous experience in M&E: “Using the Framework is easy as it is brief, it is clear what the impact is at each vertical level and also the time frame. So we can predict what will be achieved and when”. Even those who did not support M&E recognized that the Framework was easy to use once they became familiar with it.

However, for some, their initial exposure to the CDE Framework was difficult. In part, this was a consequence of the introduction of M&E effectively being delayed for more than a year after the Facility commenced. This delay was identified by the Facility management as undesirable as reflected by the statement that “In hindsight, I would have had the M&E Adviser start earlier and [have] longer to bed down the M&E at the start and get the Lead Advisers more involved in the process and really understanding it.”

Following the introduction of M&E, planning for M&E occurred concurrently with activity design. Initially the team found this was “difficult at the beginning as we were already in the middle of the program and half of the activities had already been designed … and we were already dealing with many new things. However, as advisers and managers became more familiar with M&E, they also became more accepting of M&E and generally found it easy to use. For example, a Lead Adviser explained that “Developing the results chain is getting easier now that we are used to it, … We’re getting better at it and can produce the results chain faster.”

Another senior manager opposed to M&E at the start of AIPEG, initially found “documenting the picture of success and trying not to replicate the output [was] difficult … I realise [now] that how you put the picture of success on paper was just how you see it. Is not a case of trying to intellectualise it, it is really just think and write.”

Once the M&E was established, the M&E team found that the “implementation of the M&E is relatively easy. They attributed this to the clear directions the CDE Framework provided for implementing M&E:

   In AIPEG because we use this Framework, we know from the start what we are looking for … so we knew what to look for. It encouraged us to dig more deeply. On [another program] we just looked for data and then analysed it, so it was not directed. We didn’t look at the different capacity development levels. The AIPEG way is better, it is clearer, … this makes us more focussed in what we are looking at and what AIPEG is contributing too … The RiC helps us easily develop the evaluation questions based on the timeframe and
level of outcome. ... On [another program], I couldn’t see where [the data collected] fitted because we didn’t have the Framework\textsuperscript{ccclvi}.

This was important given the extremely limited M&E expertise available during this period. Consequently, application of the CDE Framework was not dependent on provision of extensive M&E expertise. However, as discussed later, additional support would have been advantageous.

All those involved in AIPEG recognised\textsuperscript{ccclvii} that CDE Framework was “meant be integrated into all activities and not separate ... [with] good design resulting in good M&E, they flow from each other”\textsuperscript{ccclviii}. As AusAID explained, the fact that “evaluation of capacity development is embedded into all activities as AIPEG defines the output and the outcome at the start in the activity design document ... [is a] strength of the approach taken to evaluation of capacity development”\textsuperscript{ccclix}. This was also reflected by the independent review of the M&E System that reported, “The strength of the M&E ... is the clear program logic underpinning all activity design and subsequent M&E activities”\textsuperscript{ccclx}. However, in practice, integration was a ‘work in progress’ and “there was still a process for internalising M&E going on”\textsuperscript{ccclxi}. For some team members, the CDE Framework had supported the integration as reflected by the statement that the approach to “M&E on AIPEG ... made us think on the importance of integrating M&E or linking the M&E with the design of the program or activity, not as a separate activity”\textsuperscript{ccclxii}. However, this perspective was the exception and M&E had not been fully integrated into the activities.

In some cases, the limited integration was a consequence of a few Lead Advisers wanting to identify outputs and outcomes as they implemented the activity rather than to plan them in advance\textsuperscript{ccclxiii}. In other cases, Lead Advisers considered M&E a separate activity that created additional work, which was not part of their responsibility\textsuperscript{ccclxiv}. This is likely to be the consequence of moving from a culture where M&E was non-existent or at best, superficial, to one in which it was intended to play a significant role. This perception of M&E creating extra work was further exacerbated by the move from an output to outcome focus, introduction of a capacity development approach and the new requirement in response to AusAID’s introduction of M&E Standards, to develop rigorous baselines for activities. Establishing rigorous baselines was a particular issue given that many advisers considered documenting baselines as the most difficult part of the process. They noted, that “if we didn’t have to do this, it would be a much
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easier process” ccclxvi. It should be noted that baselines do not form an element of the CDE Framework.

To compound this situation, many team members had a limited understanding of both design and M&E. As a result, they did not distinguish between the challenges they faced with design and those with M&E. For example, one Lead Adviser identified the difficulty in determining what outputs should be produced before an adviser commenced their input as a difficulty with the approach to M&E ccclxvii.

In summary, the CDE Framework was easy to use and not dependent on extensive M&E expertise. While theoretically fully integrated into activities, attitudinal barriers limited the extent of integration in practice.

**Realistic resource requirements:** Requirement for human, time and financial resources are not significant and the benefits outweigh the resource costs. Ideally, limited requirement for data.

Human and financial resource allocations for M&E on AIPEG were low. However perceptions about the appropriateness of the level of financial and human resources required varied widely across stakeholders. This variation appeared to be dependent on the individual’s attitude to M&E.

AIPEG’s M&E budget (less than 1.5% of the Facility budget) was well below AusAID’s guideline of 5 to 7% of the budget. In line with this, the independent review of the M&E System found “no evidence that M&E resources were excessive” ccclxviii. Likewise, none of the independent reviews identified concerns with the level of resources required in relation to the CDE Framework; the only concern was in relation to whether the resources required for one of the data collection and analysis methods reflected value for money ccclxx. Together this indicates that the financial resources required to apply the CDE Framework were reasonable.

Human resources allocated to AIPEG M&E were also constrained. This is reflected by the absence of full-time M&E support for over a year and the appointment of an M&E Officer with relatively little M&E experience who spent much of her time on other activities ccclxx. In addition, the international adviser was part-time, providing an average of 80 days per year. This limited support provided a challenge as indicated by senior managers reflecting that “The fact that the M&E Adviser came in part-time was also a constraint to getting the Lead Advisers fully committed as they would forget about M&E as soon as the M&E Adviser left” ccclxxi. Consequently, there was a general recognition that this was insufficient and a full-time,
experienced M&E Adviser was required. This appointment was made in late 2013. However, despite the constrained financial and human resources, the M&E was successfully implemented and was agreed to meet needs.

The actual amount of time required by team and managers to develop and implement the CDE Framework was generally not considered excessive. Most Lead Advisers and advisers acknowledged that they would need to allocate time to develop and implement a robust M&E System and considered the time required to be reasonable. While AusAID officers recognised the value of being involved in the M&E, they did not participate in planning or implementing M&E and the AusAID managers considered reading evaluation reports a “luxury”. Consequently AusAID officers and managers indicated that they allocated very little time to M&E on AIPEG and concluded that “the M&E did not take too much of my time.”

While the reality was that the M&E based on the CDE Framework was implemented with minimal resources, the perception of resource requirements was dependent on the individual’s attitude to M&E rather than the actual resource level. For example, one Lead Adviser, who did not initially see the value of M&E, considered the design of M&E and activities was “a long-drawn out process and could be simpler”. However, he acknowledged that if it were simpler, the M&E would not provide information on the factors that had affected outcomes and whether the outputs had been used. He later concluded, “I don’t think that the time required for M&E was onerous. I didn’t hear any complaints from anyone. Another, who placed little value on M&E, allocated minimal time to considering or applying M&E findings as reflected by the comment: “if I don’t like the evaluation, I don’t need to do anything”. This was in contrast to those who valued M&E and allocated significant time to respond to both positive and negative issues identified. These Lead Advisers did not consider this time as excessive. The independent review team viewed these “divergent views on workload as a management issue, as opposed to an evaluation or M&E design issue.”

In summary, the financial and human resource requirements for M&E on AIPEG were extremely low. However, the user’s perception of the resources required for application of the CDE Framework varied widely depending on their broader attitude to M&E. Those who value M&E expressed the opinion that the resource requirements were not excessive, while those who did
not value M&E considered the resource requirements excessive. As support for M&E increased over time, so did the perception of the reasonableness of the level of resources required.

**Rigour:** Supports implementation of rigorous, but not excessive, evaluations with honest findings. While quantitative analysis was often desired, this was not a consistent element of this criterion.

The design and implementation of AIPEG’s M&E System, and the findings it produced, were seen to be rigorous; significantly more so than the system used on the previous phase of the Facility. This was largely a result of the CDE Framework enabling the team to “define clear and measurable outcomes at the immediate, intermediate, and end outcome level with partner agencies.”

All independent reviews discussed the quality of AIPEG’s M&E system, with the Independent Mid Term Review concluding, “The M&E System for activities is comprehensively set out in the AIPEG M&E Plan ... the systems now in place to monitor and evaluate activities represent good practice and are being consistently applied.” All users of the system also reported its rigour. For example, AusAID managers stated that they were “pretty confident in the results of the evaluations ... This evaluation is much more structured [than those I have previously experienced].” Similarly, an adviser identified that:

The strength of the system used for evaluation is that it is extremely rigorous and so it is likely to produce more confidence in the findings of the evaluation. It is a robust process that should give confidence to use the results.

This rigour was considered by users to result from both the CDE Framework and the methods used for data collection and analysis. In particular, the improved rigour of M&E on AIPEG in comparison to that on the previous Program was attributed to introduction of the CDE Framework. This is demonstrated in the words of one manager who had worked on the previous Facility who stated that using the CDE Framework:

is much better than on [the previous program]. If I compare it what we did on [the previous program], it was a joke. We made it up as we went along. I wrote a one page report on each activity without any data as an administrative task. The M&E Framework that we developed on AIPEG is streets ahead. [In comparison to the previous project it] is resource intensive, but if we are doing what we should do, it tells us whether we can do it better and what has changed.
At the same time, one AusAID manager who praised the rigour of this M&E in comparison to those he had previously experienced also described the process as “luxurious”. However, given that the actual resources used were significantly less than suggested in AusAID’s guidelines, it is difficult to see how the evaluations could be considered extravagant.

Despite the recognition of the M&E’s rigour, there were also concerns over whether findings from rigorous internal evaluations could contribute to decision making or if this required findings from independent external evaluations. For example, a partner agency manager considered external independent evaluations were necessary to avoid bias. This position was also echoed by a senior AusAID manager who considered that while the:

> internal evaluation was fine in terms of it being honest and accurately answering how things were tracking. ... When you go to the level higher, you can’t just blithely accept an internal assessment ... You really need someone to do it who is completely independent, who had no association with the program at all.

Thus, use of the CDE Framework was seen to support rigorous evaluations through the specification of clearly defined, measurable outcomes at the immediate, intermediate, and end outcome level. However, external managers were unsure whether findings from internal evaluations could be used as they may not be objective regardless of their rigour.

**Versatility:** Applicable at different levels of a system; in different sectors and cultures; for different sized agencies; for initiatives of different size, implementation strategy and stage in project life-cycle; enable a variety of M&E methodologies.

The CDE Framework was applied to all capacity development initiatives funded through AIPEG. This included small initiatives of $50,000, through to large initiatives of over of one million dollars. These initiatives encompassed developing capacity of investigators, negotiators, planners, financiers, accountants, auditors, information technology technicians and public relations specialists who were working in trade, tax, bureaucratic reform and insurance. There were no examples of capacity development initiatives on AIPEG to which the Framework could not be applied. Consequently, the CDE Framework was considered by all those interviewed on AIPEG as being versatile.

In addition, most of those interviewed recognised that while providing direction, the Framework was also flexible. This is indicated in the following statement by an adviser:
The RiC is a clear plan, which helps me to do my work more easily. Having the RiC is like having a reminder or GPS [global positioning system], it shows you where you want to go, you just see it. If you want to change your destination, you just change the RiC.

Consequently, the Framework was able to respond to changes in timing, the regulatory environment and industry or partner agency perspective. As a result, the ability to use the Framework to establish a flexible plan for M&E was seen as a strong positive. This is demonstrated by the comment from an adviser in relation to the RiC that: “if you have a good structure and you know the boundaries within which you have to work, it is easier. The boundaries can always be varied if needed.”

In addition, the perceived versatility of the CDE Framework is reflected in the evaluator’s, adviser’s and manager’s belief that the Framework should, and could, be applied on other initiatives. For example, an AusAID manager stated that “the RiC is useful and should be applied on all programs.” This broader applicability had already been demonstrated with a member of the evaluation team stating she had introduced the Framework into an Indonesian university for their M&E. She experienced the same benefits from applying the CDE Framework in the university context as on AIPEG. In particular she reflected that applying the Framework:

- Helped me understand the program and its scope. It clarified what was to be achieved, when, the indicators, the questions, and it clarified the expectations for everyone. ... They gave high support to M&E as they now understand it. ... [M&E is now] looking at how to improve things, it is not an audit or police officer’s role which is how it was seen before.

Overall, the CDE Framework was found to be versatile on AIPEG, being able to be applied to the variety of initiatives AIPEG funded and adapt to meet changes required during implementation. In addition, it was successfully applied by a user in another context and others intend to apply it elsewhere.

**Use and usability:** Findings are provided in a timely manner and can be used to support the partner agency in planning and decision-making; donor in program planning and implementation of other activities; and communication with stakeholders and also meet the information needs of the program.
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Application of the CDE Framework on AIPEG supported usability. However, actual use was found to depend on the attitude of managers and advisers to M&E, and the extent to which they agreed with the findings.

During the design process, it was expected that the findings would provide the required information in a timely manner. Through this, intended users anticipated that the CDE Framework would support use of findings to improve activity implementation. Following conduct of evaluations, the independent evaluators identified that this had generally occurred. They concluded that:

In most part, the information produced in the evaluations has been useful and the information has been used in a positive way to improve future designs of activities and operations. The information it produced has been fed into the process to strengthen the capacity development activities.

However, at the Sub-facility level, application of findings was mixed: “Unfortunately, this has not been done across the board, and it depends on the personalities involved. Some embrace it and use it to improve their activities, while others see it as a criticism and take it personally.” This was well demonstrated within a single Sub-facility where one manager responsible for the Sub-facility’s use of findings and for encouraging the partner agency to use the findings stated: “I use [the findings] as I see fit ... if I don’t like the evaluation I don’t need to do anything, if I think it is fair, then I will use it.” Because the findings identified a number of issues associated with implementation, this manager chose not to implement the findings:

I don’t think that the evaluation findings are being used. ... I am not interested in saying it could have been better or different if these things were done differently because you can always do things better or differently. I am more of a ‘I have done what I had to do, to the best that I can do it, and if you don't want to use it, then that's not my fault’ type of person. So the evaluation of the outcomes is not what I am interested in.

This manager did not provide the findings to the partner agency because from his perspective:

This is an AusAID process and I think I specifically said with the [evaluation] that I am not going to circulate it ... [Consequently] I don’t think [the findings] went around the partner agency, I actually don’t think that they would be interested.
In contrast other managers within the same team used these findings to help improve management of the Sub-facility, design subsequent activities and did provide the information to the partner agency. When this information was provided, anecdotal evidence suggests that the partner agency used the findings. In other sub-facilities the findings were used and shared with partners, even where the Lead Adviser did not like the findings and disputed those findings that were not positive.

In addition, the ability of the CDE Framework to provide information that met the needs of the initiative was significant in changing the attitude of a senior manager toward M&E. As a result, he went from opposing M&E to becoming an M&E champion. In this case, his colleagues explained:

"[Named manager] is a good case study. How to convert people to M&E? It is not easy until they see the light. He has gone from someone quite sceptical to being quite supportive ... by doing the evaluation he saw things that he thought were going very well and then found that they are likely to achieve nothing, this really changed his perspective. He saw the benefits of M&E.

From AusAID’s perspective, it was essential that the evaluation reports were short and provided the information they required for briefings and to complete AusAID’s Quality at Implementation reporting. The information AusAID managers required for the AIPEG Quality at Implementation reporting was at an end outcomes level for each Sub-facility and the Facility; information in relation to outcomes from specific activities was not relevant to AusAID. However, because the aid delivery mechanism being utilized was a Facility, it was difficult to aggregate evaluation findings across activities until the third year. Consequently, findings from evaluations did not support use by AusAID in their Quality at Implementation reporting until almost three years into Facility implementation.

Beyond use in Quality at Implementation reporting, AusAID managers working on AIPEG were only able to identify one instance where the findings from evaluations may have contributed to their decision making. The example they gave was in relation to whether support to a particular area would be continued. In this case, the evaluation indicated that progress towards the outcome was occurring and AusAID continued providing funding. Further limiting use of findings to support planning and implementation of other initiatives, was the fact that AusAID did not share the findings from AIPEG’s internal evaluations. AusAID concluded, “In practice,
the findings were of more benefit to the program team than us. This may also be, as previously identified, a consequence of AusAID managers reading few of the evaluations, or their summaries, due to time constraints.

From this research, the design of the CDE Framework supported use of findings by the AIPEG management team and Sub-Facilities (subject to the individual’s attitude). However, it is unclear whether the CDE Framework supported use within AusAID. This may be a consequence of the aid modality through which assistance on AIPEG was being provided or the attitude of individuals involved.

Summary

Overall, the CDE Framework demonstrated the characteristics intended users had identified as required in a useful framework for evaluation of capacity development (Table 20). This is well reflected in the comments by an independent evaluator who stated that the CDE Framework: “is definitely a Framework that I would consider using or recommending for future use. It meets all the criteria that I mentioned before. It is not oversimplifying, it is intuitively clear, and it helps manage expectations.”

Questions the framework is to answer.

What has changed? Demonstration of planned change in individual’s knowledge, skills and behaviour and the organisation. To a lesser extent, contribution and unintended change.

Application of the CDE Framework on AIPEG did enable identification of change in the skills, knowledge and behaviour of individuals and change at the organisation level and also AIPEG’s contribution to this change. However, there was no evidence to indicate whether unintended changes were also identified.
Table 20. Summary of performance of CDE Framework on AIPEG against users’ criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>CDE Framework’s demonstration of the required characteristics on AIPEG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easy to understand</td>
<td>Simplicity of language, concepts and presentation.</td>
<td>✓ Language, concepts and presentation found to be simple. Simplicity was due to definitions of output and immediate outcome, and presentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>? The four elements of capacity presented greatest challenge to understanding, in particular organisation and enabling environment as elements of capacity development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to use</td>
<td>Practical rather than theoretical in implementation. Integrated into activity implementation rather than a separate function. Does not require M&amp;E expertise to implement.</td>
<td>✓ Easy to apply, application became easier as experience developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Used effectively despite limited availability of M&amp;E expertise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Integrated into activities as a consequence of the design of activities being based on the CDE Framework. However, attitudinal barriers among some Lead Advisers limited integration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic resource requirements</td>
<td>Requirement for human, time and financial resources are not significant and the benefits outweigh the resource costs. Ideally, limited requirement for data.</td>
<td>✓ Resource levels were not unreasonably high.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>An individual’s attitude to M&amp;E affected their opinion on whether the resource requirements were realistic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigour</td>
<td>Supports implementation of rigorous, but not excessive, evaluations with honest findings. While quantitative analysis was often desired, this was not a consistent element of this criterion.</td>
<td>✓ Supported rigorous evaluations through the specification of clearly defined, measurable outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Versatility</td>
<td>Applicable at different levels of a system; in different sectors and cultures; for different sized agencies; for initiatives of different size, implementation strategy and stage in project life-cycle; enable a variety of M&amp;E methodologies.</td>
<td>✓ Was applicable to all activities supporting economic governance capacity development in various agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Was applicable for M&amp;E of activity and Sub-facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Has been applied by users to projects undertaken at a University in Indonesia. Other users intend to apply it elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>CDE Framework’s demonstration of the required characteristics on AIPEG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use and usability</td>
<td>Findings support use and are provided in a timely manner. Findings can be used to support the partner agency in planning and decision-making; the donor in program planning and implementation of other activities; and communication with stakeholders; and also meet the information needs of the program.</td>
<td>✓ CDE Framework supported usability of M&amp;E. Actual use of findings was dependent on the manager’s attitude to M&amp;E and the findings rather than the CDE Framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>? There is limited anecdotal evidence of supporting partners planning or decision-making.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All stakeholders interviewed during the design of the M&E System were confident that the CDE Framework would identify what had, and had not, changed. As the M&E was implemented, there was agreement across all user groups that by using the CDE Framework, evaluations did identify what change had occurred, and equally, what change had not occurred. For example, the independent evaluator stated that “The evaluations did ... say what the organisation was doing differently ... The evaluations were pitched helpfully according to the Framework, it showed the changes against the one and three year outcomes, and other things may yet come out.” Similarly an adviser noted that “if we are doing what we should do [i.e. applying the CDE Framework as intended], it tells us ... what has changed.” Managers and advisers also reported numerous examples of where change had been identified. For example, several user groups identified changes in areas of the Trade Sub-Facility. As a manager explained:

> The findings certainly did show us what had changed in various parts of Trade Sub-Facility. It certainly gave us evidence that capacity had been built in trade in services, negotiations, legal support; and that their counterparts are more aware and alert to things that they should be doing proactively, that they felt comfortable in their role and international negotiations, and it also showed that external people involved felt that the trade negotiators are better prepared for negotiations. It also showed that other departments were happier to discuss issues with them and meet the Department of Trade, as they were now more competent.

This was also supported by an AusAID manager: “The internal evaluations did show what changes had occurred. .... The ones of most note were for tax and trade. Yes, through the evaluations I could definitely see the changes that had occurred. Other AusAID managers
working on AIPEG stated that through the evaluations they “could see the changes ... as a consequence of activities” and identified specific changes in a number of sub-facilities. These AusAID managers considered that the ability of the CDE Framework to demonstrate change over time was a strong positive feature of the Framework. Because of this feature, subsequent to their role managing AIPEG, all AusAID managers interviewed stated that they would use the CDE Framework in future. For example, “I would use this model again ... because it is an approach that measures change over time ... I like it, it is very good.”

However, during implementation AusAID managers were concerned that this information was at the activity rather than the Sub-facility level required for their reporting. For example, after six to 12 months of support to an area within the Department of Tax, AusAID managers were concerned that “We didn’t have any information on how the institution as a whole had changed. We still didn’t see how tax collection had increased.” This unrealistic expectation about the rate at which organisational, let alone institutional change occurs, may have been linked to AusAID managers perceived need to demonstrate change quickly. In addition, it reflected a lack of understanding of the difference between a Program and Facility modality – a Facility being designed to produce changes in relationships rather than capacity at the Facility level, and change in capacity and/or performance at an activity level (Dawson, 2009).

Managers and advisers also noted that the approach to evaluation used before the introduction of the CDE Framework had not enabled change (or lack of change) to be identified. This was reflected in the statement of a manager that, while they could identify change resulting from activities designed after introducing the CDE Framework, they could not identify change “for many of the activities that we took over from [the previous program] and the ones that were designed early in the program [before the introduction of the CDE Framework].” In addition, as previously discussed, the lack of M&E rigour on the previous phase, also indicates that prior to the introduction of the CDE Framework, the team was unable to determine whether change had or had not occurred.

Those interviewed expected that change would be demonstrated through the definition of immediate and intermediate outcomes and the “picture of success” that had been defined for each outcome. This was summarised by one team member who explained the CDE Framework identified change through: “the RiC [which] has different stages which can help us to have a better portrait of what is change at the individual level or organisation ... The RiC helped us see
this type of change⁴ and it “identify[s] the outputs and outcomes so that we can clearly identify the change. We see this through the picture of success⁵. While the M&E also identified unplanned changes, in all cases this was associated with the use of a particular data collection tool (Most Significant Change). In addition, no one interviewed associated this with the CDE Framework itself. Consequently, there is insufficient evidence from this case study to determine whether CDE Framework contributed on AIPEG to identification of unplanned change.

For each of the evaluations undertaken, AIPEG’s contribution (or lack of contribution) to the changes was identified. In particular, most of the evaluations articulated how this contribution was determined, and in each of these cases, elements of the CDE Framework were specified. The process for determining contribution was by applying the causality question to consider and eliminate possible alternative explanations for identified changes. Following this, consistency between anticipated change as expressed in the RiC and actual change was determined. Where the partners attributed the changes to AIPEG, the changes observed aligned with the RiC and alternative explanations had been eliminated, the conclusion was drawn that AIPEG had contributed to the change or was on target to contribute to the change. For example, several reports made comments similar to:

the fact that progress is being made along the results chain would suggest that it is reasonable to conclude the activity is on schedule to contribute to [the partner] achieving this outcome. This is further supported by [the partner] management’s perspective.⁶

Use of the CDE Framework also identified where AIPEG had not contributed to the change that had occurred. Again, this was attributed to consideration of the results chain articulated in the CDE Framework. In this case, the evaluation showed that the change had been achieved without achievement of most of the outputs or the immediate outcome. Consequently, the evaluation concluded that it was therefore likely that the activities had not contributed to the change.

In summary, the CDE Framework did enable identification of the change in the skills, knowledge and behaviour of individuals and at the organisation level as a result of the definitions of output and outcome and specification of the picture of success. However, it did not show change at a Sub-facility level in the time frame desired by AusAID and there is insufficient evidence to determine whether the Framework provides information on unintended change. The CDE
Framework did support assessment of AIPEG contribution to change and identified situations where contribution had and had not occurred. This was through the results chain documented in the CDE Framework.

**What progress has been made toward sustainable achievement of the objective? Has the original objective been achieved and if not, what progress has been made toward its achievement? Can the improvements in organisational performance be continued?**

Across all stakeholder groups, there was widespread agreement that application of the CDE Framework on AIPEG enabled identification of progress towards the objective and sustainability of outcomes\(^{cdxxvi}\). This perspective had commenced when the CDE Framework was applied in the activity design phase; with one exception, all those interviewed believed that the Framework would enable progress towards outcomes to be monitored\(^{cdxxvii}\). Following implementation of M&E, everyone interviewed was confident that both progress and areas where there was a lack of progress towards outcomes had been identified\(^{cdxxviii}\). This was also the finding of the Independent Review of the M&E System which concluded: “Review respondents were comfortable with AIPEG’s activity monitoring processes, and also acknowledged that AIPEG’s M&E Plan has provided a solid framework to measure progress and realize improvements\(^{rcdxxx}\).”

The role of the CDE Framework (known as the RiC within AIPEG) in identifying progress was clearly articulated. For example, a member of the evaluation team said that: “The M&E did show us the progress because of the RiC, it was clearly stated on the RiC. When we are progressing according to the RiC, then we would progress toward the outcome\(^{rcdxxi}\). The clearly defined output and outcomes in the RiC forced team members to consider whether “what is happening .. is in line with our expectations, if it is more or less than our expectations ... [to] ask the questions about how it compares to expectations and why the difference\(^{rcdxbli}\). Through this process, progress was clear. This was echoed in an adviser’s statement that the M&E showed progress:

> As long as the RiC is designed well. This means that the outcomes will be clear and concise and hit the mark in terms of what you are aiming at. If you have the immediate, intermediate, and end outcomes right, it is really easy to see the progress. If you don’t, if they are vague, it is hard\(^{rcdxbli}\).
The contribution the CDE Framework made to monitoring progress on AIPEG was clearly demonstrated by comparing situations where the CDE Framework had and had not been applied. For example, an AusAID manager confirmed that while the internal AIPEG M&E based on the CDE Framework indicated progress, progress could not be determined from AusAID’s independent evaluations that did not use the CDE Framework. Similarly, those who had worked on the previous phase of AIPEG also indicated that prior to the introduction of the CDE Framework, progress towards outcomes was not monitored.

Determining whether the Framework contributed to identifying achievement of the objective was constrained by those interviewed having difficulty in distinguishing between whether the objective would be achieved, and whether the Framework would enable achievement of the objective to be determined. Consequently, their responses often appear to be more related to whether AIPEG would achieve its objective than whether the CDE Framework would enable this to be determined. Because of this difficulty in separating the difference in this question, few interviewees actually addressed whether the CDE Framework would enable assessment of achievement of objective. Those who did differentiate these questions indicated that the Framework would provide the information required to determine achievement (or otherwise) of the objective. However, one AusAID manager did not think this would be identified through the M&E. He suggested this was a consequence of the Facility objective being unclear rather than issues with the Framework.

Following implementation of the evaluations, the team generally felt that the evaluations had provided evidence of sustainability. Team members and evaluation reports provided specific examples of outcomes shown to be sustainable and outcomes shown to have low likelihood of sustainability. However, a small number of those interviewed could not remember whether sustainability had been identified, let alone CDE Framework’s contribution to this identification. Others thought that no Framework could provide evidence on sustainability because sustainability could not be determined until several years after the program was completed. Surprisingly, sustainability was either not a priority nor of interest to a number of interviewees. In general, those who identified that the CDE Framework had signalled the likelihood of the outcomes sustainability suggested this information was drawn from the combination of several elements of the CDE Framework. This is best reflected in the statement that “we will be able to see [sustainability] from the outcome and what the success picture looks like. Also from the risks, this will give us a picture about the sustainability.”
Significantly, several interviewees found that use of the CDE Framework encouraged a proactive approach to consideration of sustainability. For example, an adviser commented, “because the RiC is a clear summary of what we are trying to achieve in terms of outcomes, this prompts you to ask if it is sustainable”.

In summary, progress and lack of progress were clearly identified and information on sustainability of outcomes provided. This had not been possible before the CDE Framework was introduced. In addition, the CDE Framework encouraged users to consider sustainability. This was through the definition of outcomes at different levels combined with the picture of success, and perhaps the risk component. While there is evidence that the CDE Framework supports answering the question of achievement of objective on AIPEG, this evidence is limited.

**Was the capacity development strategy effective? Did the capacity development strategy work?**

Advisers, managers and AusAID managers were confident that the M&E had identified effective and ineffective capacity development strategies. They were able to provide specific examples of situations where the evaluation had uncovered previously unidentified weaknesses in capacity development strategies. For example, an AusAID manager stated, “it told us that the IT mentor activity didn’t work for various reasons, including ones that were not expected. It identified what these reasons were”. In other cases, the evaluation identified that there had not initially been a capacity gap and therefore, the capacity development strategy had not contributed to the outcomes.

These findings were reported in each evaluation report, along with recommendations to improve capacity development strategies. On reviewing these reports, the independent evaluator confirmed that the AIPEG’s internal evaluations identified the effectiveness of AIPEG’s capacity development strategy. He stated:

> What I got from the evaluation and the Framework was the most compelling case for the way AIPEG expects capacity development to work. It told me how AIPEG saw capacity development and the evaluation results told me how that concept of capacity development was working.

In addition, several advisers, managers and members of the evaluation team reported that the CDE Framework provided an early warning mechanism about the effectiveness of different
strategies\textsuperscript{cdlxii}. This was particularly important to users as reflected in a Lead Adviser’s statement that:

Another strength [of the Framework] is that as Lead Adviser, I can find out early on if we are likely to achieve the outcomes, if we are on track or need to change things a bit, often [before this M&E System] we wouldn’t get this information at all\textsuperscript{cdlxii}.

The contribution the CDE Framework made to identify the effectiveness of a capacity development strategy was attributed to several elements in the CDE Framework. The consistently identified element was the horizontal component\textsuperscript{cdlxiv} in conjunction with various other elements including the picture of success\textsuperscript{cdlxv} and the causality question\textsuperscript{cdlxvi}. From this, it would appear that CDE Framework’s contribution to assessment of the effectiveness of a capacity development strategy is through the clear articulation of how capacity development is expected to work (through the horizontal component and picture of success) followed by application of the causality question.

Overall, the M&E identified whether specific capacity development strategies were effective. This was through the horizontal results chain, picture of success and causality question.

**What is the impact of environmental factors on the program?** The impact environmental factors had on progress and achievement of outcomes. Changes in the context that could influence the future direction.

The CDE Framework encouraged a proactive approach to consideration of environmental factors that could influence the activity during the design process. Subsequently during implementation, the CDE Framework identified what environmental factors had influenced progress and achievement of AIPEG outcomes. However, there was no evidence to suggest the proactive approach was maintained during implementation.

During the activity design process, the CDE Framework was found to encourage thinking about environmental factors that may influence outcomes. When the evaluation was implemented, most of those interviewed across all user groups agreed that the evaluation had identified the environmental factors that influenced the outcomes\textsuperscript{cdlxvii}. For example, the independent review team stated, “The evaluations did show the factors in the environment that influence the change. ... [these] went back to the institutional context, the personality factors, the degree of participation in the design\textsuperscript{cdlxviii}. One of the evaluation team identified that through using the CDE Framework “For the three activities that we evaluated for tax, we could see factors in the
environment which meant that we could not produce the results. These factors were then identified in the evaluation reports. An AusAID manager confirmed that these M&E reports identified the environmental factors influencing the outcomes: “There are always changes in the Indonesian environment. Evaluations did show me what factors in the environment were influencing the outcome. However, this manager was concerned that he was only able to obtain information from the Facility on factors in the environment that influenced the outcomes when evaluations occurred rather than in real-time.

From the perspective of those interviewed, these environmental factors were identified through asking the causality question for the transition between output and outcome levels and considering risk in a proactive manner during design and in a reflective manner during implementation. Consequently, the CDE Framework had not encouraged the team to adopt a proactive approach during the implementation process to identify environmental change.

Unfortunately, within the first year of implementation, the manager responsible for M&E “found the risks weren’t as useful as the RiC, so I did away with it. I think it is too much data and I wanted to keep it simple.” As a result, risk was only considered six-monthly or when an evaluation occurred rather than as part of the monthly monitoring. This may contribute to explaining an AusAID manager’s concern that he was only able to obtain information on factors in the environment that influenced the outcomes in real-time. This is a management issue, rather than an issue with the CDE Framework.

Overall, the CDE Framework was found to support identification of potential and actual environmental factors that influenced outcomes during activity design and implementation though the risk analysis and the causality question.

**What lessons have been learned?** Lessons that can be applied to improve this and future initiatives.

The CDE Framework was found to contribute to lessons for application to improve AIPEG. However, while it generated lessons for external application, there is no evidence that this information was used.

Following application of the CDE Framework to develop the M&E System and activity designs, all bar one of those interviewed on AIPEG were confident that the application of this System should identify lessons for internal and external application. This confidence was maintained as the M&E was implemented with almost all of those interviewed agreeing that the M&E had
identified lessons to improve AIPEG implementation. The lessons they identified encompassed the strategic level (for example issues in regards choice of partner agencies with whom to work), management and the activity level.

The contribution of the evaluations to identifying the lessons was confirmed by the Independent Evaluator and Independent Review of the M&E System. This is reflected in a statement in the Independent Review of the M&E System: “Evaluations provided valuable lessons learnt applicable across the Facility that have resulted in improvements to Sub-facility management processes.” While many of these lessons were considered to have had external relevance, there was no evidence that they were applied outside AIPEG.

The perceived value of these lessons was largely a function of the individual’s perspective of their role on the Program. For example, the Lead Adviser who did not see promoting use of outputs as part of his responsibilities, was not interested in lessons to improve implementation. This Lead Adviser was concerned that the “lessons learned focus on the negative. If you have 12 positives and two negatives, it is the negative focus that comes through.” This contrasted other managers who stated, “The M&E certainly showed us the lessons learned in terms of a number of good things that we should apply elsewhere.”

Investigation of what part of the M&E System identified these positive and negative lessons indicated that it was primarily the risk component of the CDE Framework. This is reflected in the statement by a member of the M&E team:

“The design of the [CDE Framework] model shows us the lessons learned. When we developed the RiC, we also need to identify the risks ... In doing M&E we also monitor the risks, ... how the risks are managed and if this affects the activity this provides feedback about lessons learned.”

However, other factors were also identified as critical in identifying lessons. For example, a manager considered identification of lessons was also dependent on “having a good evaluator and someone who understands program management in an international development context.”

Thus, the application of the CDE Framework did support identification of lessons for application both to AIPEG and externally. These lessons were identified through the risk component of the CDE Framework. Some in the team also thought that this was dependent on the quality of the evaluator.
Summary

In summary, the CDE Framework provided most of the information intended users had identified as required from the evaluation of capacity development (Table 21). They consistently identified that the CDE Framework provided this information more effectively than previous M&E approaches with which they had experience. Consequently a number of team members and AusAID managers have since applied the Framework elsewhere.

Discussion.

This research was designed to determine whether the application of the CDE Framework assists the evaluation of capacity development initiatives, and if so, how the Framework did this. In terms of the AIPEG case study, the use of the CDE Framework was found to meet the needs of the intended users identified in Phase 1. This is reflected in application of the Framework providing most of the information intended users key required and demonstrating most of the characteristics intended users had specified for assessing the utility of a framework to evaluate capacity development.

In addition, the use of the CDE Framework added value to the evaluation of capacity development on AIPEG through facilitating a breadth of other benefits. The findings indicate that these benefits were primarily a consequence of clearly defining what was to be achieved at an outcomes level during the activity design process and establishing a time frame. Therefore, these benefits were largely a consequence of use the CDE Framework during activity design and may not have been achieved had the CDE Framework only been applied during the implementation stage.

The value of the CDE Framework is also demonstrated when compared to users’ experience on other programs. This is reflected by many of those involved in M&E on AIPEG’s predecessor stating that the CDE Framework was better than the previous M&E approach. They held this position because the CDE Framework had provided information that answered previously unanswered questions. In addition, most team members indicated that they would use this Framework elsewhere and several team members had already successfully applied the Framework in other contexts.
Application of the CDE Framework to the Evaluation of Capacity Development Initiatives

Table 21. Summary of performance of CDE Framework on AIPEG in providing information users require.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information users require</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>CDE Framework performance on AIPEG in providing information users require</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| What has changed?         | Demonstration of planned change in individual’s knowledge, skills and behaviour and the organisation. To a lesser extent, contribution and unintended change. | ✓ Change at output and outcome level identified. Change was identified through the results chain and picture of success.  
✓ The contribution of AIPEG to the change was demonstrated through the results chain.  
? There is no evidence that the CDE Framework contributed to identification of unintended change. |
| What progress has been made toward sustainable achievement of the objective? | Has the original objective been achieved and if not, what progress has been made toward its achievement? Can the improvements in organisational performance be continued? Can the improvements in organisational performance be sustained? | ✓ Both progress and lack of progress were identified, this had not occurred before the CDE Framework was introduced. Progress was identified through the horizontal element of the RiC.  
? There is limited evidence that the CDE Framework supports answering the question of achievement of objective.  
✓ Provided information on sustainability of outcomes through the definition of outcomes at different levels with a picture of success, and perhaps the risk component.  
✓ CDE Framework encouraged some users to consider sustainability who may otherwise not. |
| Was the capacity development strategy effective? | Did the capacity development strategy work? | ✓ CDE Framework identified whether specific capacity development strategies were effective. This was through results chain, picture of success and the causality question. |
| What is the impact of environmental factors on the program? | The impact environmental factors had on progress and achievement of outcomes. Changes in the context that could influence the future direction. | ✓ The Framework supported identification of the environmental factors that influenced the outcome though the risk analysis and the causality question. |
| What lessons have been learned? | Lessons that can be applied to improve this and future initiatives. | ✓ Lessons learned were identified. Lessons identified through the risk element. |
As a consequence of the CDE Framework’s simplicity and the evaluation findings, most of those who had previously not supported M&E became M&E supporters, and in one case, an evaluation champion. However, in a small number of other cases the reverse occurred. This was where a Lead Adviser did not accept as constructive criticism the finding that an initiative was not progressing as planned. While the findings may ultimately have been implemented, the process for this was not pleasant for those involved and did not lead to a more positive perspective of M&E.

The challenges that implementation of the M&E system faced were unrelated to the CDE Framework. For example, most advisers’ attitudes had been inculcated in a different development assistance delivery culture; one that management considered did not reflect good development practice. Consequently, management sought to change these attitudes; a change some Lead Advisers associated with M&E. While these two were independent, this association did make implementation of the M&E system more difficult for the M&E Officer. In addition, while the low level of M&E resources is likely to have presented a challenge to any M&E system, there is no evidence to suggest that it was compounded by use of the CDE Framework. In hindsight, senior management recognised that it would have been beneficial for them to provide stronger visible leadership early on, demonstrate the change in culture was broader than M&E, and provide more resources for M&E.

The main weakness evident from application of the CDE Framework on AIPEG was the consideration of the four elements of capacity development at the design stage. This appears to have created increased complexity for many of those involved. Given that most team members had a limited understanding of good design practice and M&E, it may have been advantageous to have initially introduced the CDE Framework without the vertical capacity development elements. As team members gained skills in design and M&E, the vertical element could then have been introduced. However, this may have reduced the diversity of capacity development strategies adopted.

In summary, application of the CDE Framework assisted the evaluation of capacity development on AIPEG. This primarily occurred through its use in the design stage, which lead to clarity in outcomes and timeframes for their achievement. The simplicity of language improved understanding of both the design process and M&E, and removed fear of M&E. However, the
inclusion of the four elements of capacity development at the design stage created complexity for a team unfamiliar with design, M&E and capacity development.

**SUMMARY OF THE APPLICATION OF THE CDE FRAMEWORK TO THREE CASE STUDIES**

Phase 2 of this research sought to identify whether “the application of one of the available frameworks assists the evaluation of capacity development initiatives.” To achieve this, the chapter first identified the rationale for selecting the CDE Framework from the available frameworks. Further detail on the methodology specifically relevant to Phase 2 was provided and the rationale for adopting a case study approach set out. The three case studies were presented; between them capturing initiatives of different sizes, providing support to different sectors, in different countries and through a variety of aid modalities. These initiatives were also characterised by different management structures, levels of resources for M&E and the stage in the project life cycle at which the CDE Framework was introduced.

In each case, the Framework provided most of the information required by intended users and demonstrated most characteristics intended users had specified (Chapter 4). In addition, a range of other benefits, particularly where the CDE Framework was applied during activity design, were identified. These included clarifying and establishing shared understanding of the initiative and the M&E, improving the quality of activity designs, promoting an outcomes focus, and, significantly, removing users’ fear of M&E and changing their perception of the value of M&E. As a result, users consistently identified that the application of the CDE Framework assisted the evaluation of the capacity development initiative and improved previous practice. This had led users of the CDE Framework from each of the case studies to apply the Framework to other initiatives. A cross-case analysis of these three case studies is presented in Chapter 6.
CHAPTER 6. CROSS-CASE ANALYSIS

INTRODUCTION

This research is designed to determine “whether application of one of the available frameworks assists the evaluation of capacity development initiatives, and if so, how it does this.” As part of this, Phase 1 of this research identified the characteristics that intended users consistently required a useful framework for evaluation of capacity development to demonstrate and the information evaluations needed to provide. Following this, Phase 2 considered how well the CDE Framework met these criteria when applied to three different case studies.

As discussed in Chapter 2, transferability of findings from case studies is dependent upon cases being selected to reflect the purpose of the research (Falk & Guenther, 2007; GAO, 1990), analysis extracting information on context (Popay et. al., 1998), cross case analysis (Miles and Huberman, 1994) and the receiving audiences perception (Falk & Guenther, 2007). In addition, generalisation is supported by generalisation to a theory (Bryman, 2012; Mitchell, 1983). The approach to selecting case studies that met the purpose of the research and contextual information on each case-study was presented in Chapter 5. This chapter presents the cross-case analysis which was undertaken to compare the results of each of the three case studies and audiences perception of transferability. The generalised to theory developed from the this research is presented in Chapter 7.

As part of the cross-case analysis presented in this chapter, other factors that influenced how well the CDE Framework demonstrated users’ needs are identified and discussed, as are the reasons the CDE Framework did not provide some information users required. The chapter also examines alternative explanations for the improvements users identified in M&E and the ability of the Framework to address each of the weaknesses previously identified in capacity development evaluations. Together, these findings not only provide the answer to the research question, but also determine the transferability of the conclusions.

METHODOLOGY

This chapter applies cross-case analysis to support generalisation of the findings. The cross-case analysis examined the themes, similarities, and differences that occur across the three cases analysed in Phase 2 (Mathison, 2005). This analysis was undertaken to support generalisation by (i) identifying commonalities and differences between cases in relation to the assistance that the
CDE Framework provided in evaluation of capacity development, and (ii) considering causality by developing a generalised theory about the factors that contributed to a framework for evaluating capacity development meeting users’ needs (Gerring, 2007, p. 232). This requires a balancing of what is common across the case studies with what is unique (Stake, 2006, p. 39).

In summary, to support transferability of findings, this research chose a purposive sampling approach enabling selection of interviewees and initiatives that would provide the most relevant data for the research and transferring findings to other initiatives. This is supported by describing the contextual background in detail and analysing the perspective of a breadth of intended user groups. Generalisation has also occurred to a theory that was considered through a peer debriefing process. This audience concluded that the findings were transferable. Through these mechanisms, the transferability of findings has been demonstrated as far as is possible.

Commonalities between initiatives include each initiative being AusAID funded and implemented during the same period. This means that each operated within the same donor policy context. Each initiative included an explicit requirement to develop partners’ capacity through a range of approaches, though none specified what capacity development meant or the capacity development strategies to be applied.

The differences encompassed factors related to the country in which the initiative was implemented, the initiative itself and the approach to M&E (Table 22). Within both Indonesia and Solomon Islands there is a great variety of cultures and languages, and the cultures of both are dissimilar, as is their history. Solomon Islands has emerged from conflict only in the last 10 years, the conflict Indonesia went through is (excluding localized issues) more historic. As a result, Solomon Islands’ public sector was relatively weak as it was being re-established. In contrast, Indonesia’s public sector was well established and was being strengthened.

The level of aid each country receives is also different. While Indonesia receives a large quantity of development assistance, aid forms only a small part of their revenue and is sourced from many donors. In contrast, Solomon Islands receives less funding in total but is aid dependent, with the primary aid donor being Australia. Initiatives in Indonesia tend to be large, whereas in Solomon Islands they are usually smaller. This is reflected in the case studies located in Indonesia having almost 10 times the budget of the case study in Solomon Islands.
## Table 22. Characteristics of each initiative used as a case study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>SIGHMP</th>
<th>AIPD</th>
<th>AIPEG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country in which initiative located</td>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of conflict within the country</td>
<td>Post-conflict</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector in which capacity is being developed</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Rural development</td>
<td>Economic Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic extent of support</td>
<td>Based in one location.</td>
<td>Works across multiple locations in Indonesia.</td>
<td>Works across multiple locations in Jakarta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of initiative (AUD)</td>
<td>$7.2m</td>
<td>$61m</td>
<td>$66m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of initiative</td>
<td>3 years with a 2 year extension</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid modality used to deliver assistance</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative’s management structure</td>
<td>Managing contractor appointed part-time Contractor representative.</td>
<td>AusAID staff member as full-time Program Director and Assistant Program Directors.</td>
<td>Managing contractor appointed full-time Program Director.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management support for M&amp;E</td>
<td>Contractor representative seen to be supportive of M&amp;E.</td>
<td>Program Director seen to be supportive of M&amp;E.</td>
<td>Program Director supportive of M&amp;E but this is not visible to advisers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources allocated to M&amp;E</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>2.8% (excluding M&amp;E personnel) of program budget.</td>
<td>Less than 1.5% (including M&amp;E personnel) of program budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resources to support M&amp;E</td>
<td>1 month of support from an unqualified and inexperienced adviser.</td>
<td>Full-time national and part-time international M&amp;E Specialist from before the program started. Both were qualified.</td>
<td>Full-time national one year after program commencement and part-time qualified international M&amp;E Specialist from six months after program commencement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience of team in M&amp;E</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Generally limited.</td>
<td>Generally very limited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When the CDE Framework was introduced</td>
<td>In the last 18 months of the initiative.</td>
<td>At the start of the program prior to activity design commencing.</td>
<td>After 1 year of implementation after many activities had been designed and their implementation commenced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning for M&amp;E</td>
<td>One month in parallel with implementation of activities.</td>
<td>1 year – before activities commenced (except for small ‘quick win’ activities which specifically occurred for the first year)</td>
<td>Three months in parallel with activity design and implementation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At an initiative level, the differences are not country dependent. The partners supported by each initiative vary. For example, one of the case studies (AIPD) worked with Government, NGO and private sector partners. The other two case studies only partnered with government agencies. Two of the case studies (AIPD and SIGHMP) worked closely with agencies at different levels of government; national, provincial and local, while AIPEG worked only with central government agencies. These differences impact the capacity of partners as experience shows that central agencies generally had better access to resources, educated personnel and infrastructure than local government agencies and NGO.

There were also differences in management structure. Both SIGHMP and AIPEG had an internal Program Director – employed by the managing contractor. In contrast, the Program Director on AIPD was employed by AusAID. Consequently AIPD had a short, direct communication line to AusAID. The communication line to AusAID was even longer for SIGHMP as it was subcontracted.

Each of the initiatives also had a different approach to M&E. This varied from AIPD, where M&E was well resourced, planned in advance of activity implementation and integrated into implementation, to SIGHMP which had no resourcing budgeted for M&E and, as the M&E was only planned in the final year of the initiative, it had not been integrated into the initiative. The perceived level of management support also varied between initiatives. For example, managers were seen to be strongly supportive of M&E on AIPD and SIGHMP (though AIPD did have a manager who was initially ambivalent) to AIPEG where senior managers were supportive but this support was not visible to the team, and a number of middle managers were either hostile or ambivalent.

Consideration of these commonalities and differences indicates the maximum boundaries for generalisation of these findings. As all case studies were AusAID funded initiatives, the maximum extent of generalisation is to AusAID funded initiatives. Within this, the diversity of characteristics and context of each initiative would capture almost all contexts in which AusAID programs operate. Therefore, the maximum extent of generalization is to all AusAID funded initiatives.

The analysis was undertaken by theme (GAO, 1990, p. 74), where each theme was either an area of information intended users required or a characteristic users required the Framework to demonstrate. This was summarised in a cross-case table which is presented in Appendix G.
Differences in the contexts and characteristics of each case study (Table 22) are identified as possible explanations for the variations in findings. A second cross-case analysis by theme was undertaken where each theme was one of the weaknesses with evaluations of capacity development that had been identified in the literature.

As discussed in Chapter 3, these findings were presented to participants in a series of workshops as part of the peer review process. Each of these workshops concluded that the findings were transferable to other development assistance initiatives. These findings are therefore presented as transferable to similar contexts. Based on this information, it is then the intended users’ responsibility to determine whether the Framework is transferable to a specific situation (Stake, 2006, p. 90; Gerring, 2007; p. 236).

The cross-case analysis for characteristics intended users required of a framework for evaluation of capacity development now follows.

**CHARACTERISTICS OF A USEFUL FRAMEWORK**

For each of the three case studies, the CDE Framework demonstrated most of the characteristics intended users had identified in Phase 1 of this research (Appendix G). A discussion of each characteristic follows, along with identification of contextual factors that may account for this difference.

**Easy to understand.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>SIGHMP</th>
<th>AIPD</th>
<th>AIPEG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simplicity of language, concepts and presentation.</td>
<td>Considered to be virtually self explanatory largely due to presentation. Vertical element of the Framework easy to understand.</td>
<td>Language, concepts and presentation found to be simple. Through the definition of output and outcome and the diagram. The term ‘enabling environment’ led to confusion with climate change.</td>
<td>Language, concepts and presentation found to be simple. Simplicity was due to definitions of output and immediate outcome, and presentation. The four elements of capacity presented greatest challenge to understanding, in particular organisation and enabling environment as elements of capacity development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23. Summary of findings for CDE Framework’s demonstration of the required ease of understanding across cases.
As Table 23 demonstrates, across all three case studies, the Framework was considered to be easy to understand. The language, concepts and presentation were each perceived to be relatively simple. In large part, this was credited to the CDE Framework’s simple definitions for output and each level of outcome. This contrasted most users’ previous experience where differentiating between outputs and outcomes had often been difficult and unclear. The differentiation between output (a product – something that can usually be held) and an immediate outcome (the use of the product) was the critical element in these definitions.

As previously noted, this differentiation: “had people glued to their seats. It was almost like a hallelujah moment for those who had been involved in monitoring and evaluation training before, people grasped the concept really quickly.”

The only element of the Framework that challenged some user’s understanding was the vertical component comprising the four elements of capacity development proposed by UNDP (1997). This was because many users had a poor understanding of the breadth of capacity development. For example, while users recognised the individual as a focus of capacity development and training as a capacity development strategy, most were unused to thinking of capacity development addressing organisations, networks and the enabling environment. Consequently, on AIPEG these elements of capacity development were not considered by most of the team nor included in their capacity development strategy. In contrast, on the third case study (SIGHMP) the team concluded that the vertical component was the most valuable part of the Framework as it highlighted areas of capacity that they were not addressing.

Understanding of the term “enabling environment” was also a challenge for some. In this case, the current focus on climate change led a number of those interviewed to assume that enabling environment referred to the natural environment and included climate change. Here, it was the specific words in the Framework that created the misunderstanding.

The reason for the difference in perspective between SIGHMP and AIPEG may be a consequence of the difference in middle management attitude to capacity development. On SIGHMP, capacity development and sustainability was considered critical by the Team Leader and team. Thus, the vertical element of the Framework exposed areas for which capacity had not been developed (in particular related to networks and organisation) which enabled the team to address these areas. They were universally pleased that these weaknesses were identified and could be addressed. In contrast, on AIPEG the Lead Adviser who was committed to sustainability found the vertical element a challenge, but useful. The other Lead Advisers were uncommitted to either capacity
development or sustainability. In this context, the vertical element was perceived to create additional work with little, if any, added value. Consequently, they did not support it.

**Easy to use.**

**Table 24. Summary of findings for CDE Framework’s demonstration of the required ease of use across cases.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>SIGHMP</th>
<th>AIPD</th>
<th>AIPEG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practical rather than theoretical in implementation.</td>
<td>Easy to apply for those with limited or no M&amp;E experience.</td>
<td>All users found the CDE Framework easy to implement.</td>
<td>Easy to apply, application became easier as experience developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated into activity implementation rather than a separate function.</td>
<td>Not dependent on the availability of M&amp;E expertise.</td>
<td>The key elements were output and outcome definitions, and the key evaluation questions.</td>
<td>Not dependent on extensive M&amp;E expertise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not require M&amp;E expertise to implement.</td>
<td>Not integrated into activities due to timing of introduction.</td>
<td>The M&amp;E system and activity implementation were fully integrated.</td>
<td>Integrated into activities as a consequence of the design of activities being based on the CDE Framework. However, attitudinal barriers among some Lead Advisers limited integration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those who applied the CDE Framework found it easy to use for each of the three case studies (Table 24). There was general agreement that it was practical rather than theoretical, not dependent on excessive M&E expertise, and the M&E was integrated into the design and implementation.

Application of the CDE Framework was not dependent on the presence of extensive M&E expertise. Where the M&E expertise on the initiative was limited (SIGHMP and to a lesser extent AIPEG), this did not constrain the ability of the team to apply the Framework. Likewise, the experience of SIGHMP indicates that the value of the findings to the team, and the team’s use of these findings, was not dependent on the presence of M&E expertise.

Where the Framework was applied during the design stage (AIPD and AIPEG) there was significant evidence to indicate that the Framework supported integration of M&E, design and implementation. This integration was primarily achieved through establishing a clear program logic that then shaped the entire initiative and individual activitiescdxiii. This integration was facilitated by strong, visible senior management support for M&E. Consequently, on AIPEG this
integration was still a work in progress as this support was less visible. Even within the same initiative (AIPEG), the extent of integration of M&E with activity implementation was greater where a Lead Adviser supported M&E and was committed to capacity development.

As with ease of understanding of the CDE Framework, the greatest constraint to ease of use appears to be that the Framework contained two dimensions. Some advisers on AIPEG identified that having a vertical and horizontal dimension increased the complexity of applying the Framework. In particular, they had a limited understanding of use of UNDP’s four elements of capacity development. However, as previously noted, another initiative (SIGHMP) found that the vertical element was of the most value and easy to use.

Thus, the Framework was easy to apply. The only challenge was a consequence of poor understanding of the breadth of capacity development. Visible support from managers was an enabling factor.

**Realistic resource requirement.**

**Table 25. Summary of findings for CDE Framework’s demonstration of realistic resource requirements across cases.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>SIGHMP</th>
<th>AIPD</th>
<th>AIPEG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requirements for human, time and financial resources are not significant and the benefits outweigh the resource costs. Ideally, limited requirement for data.</td>
<td>In a context where there was no budget for internal monitoring provided by the client, resource requirements were minimal and realistic. The benefits were seen to outweigh the costs. Data requirements were realistic.</td>
<td>Realistic (or even reduced) resource requirements through integration into activity management and clarifying data requirements and which activities should/should not be evaluated.</td>
<td>Resource levels were not unreasonably high. An individual’s attitude to M&amp;E affected their opinion on whether the resource requirements were realistic.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The three cases studied each operated in a different context with respect to resources. At one extreme, SIGHMP did not have a budget for M&E and at the other extreme (AIPD) the team found they could “propose anything as long as it is strategic and ... it is usually supported.” Despite these different environments, each of the case studies found that the resources required to apply the CDE Framework were realistic in that context (Table 25).

In each case, the budget for M&E was well within the indicative range specified by AusAID and none of the independent reviews considered allocation of resources to M&E were excessive. In
addition, the small number of individuals who initially considered that resource requirements may have been excessive, all subsequently reversed their position and concluded that the resources required were reasonable. Thus, across all three case studies, the resources required to design and implement the M&E system based on the CDE Framework were considered reasonable by all those interviewed.

Those interviewed for each of the case studies believed that the M&E’s data requirements were realistic. This was considered to be a consequence of the application of the CDE Framework resulting in the clear specification of data need. Application of the CDE Framework during the design stage (AIPD and AIPEG) further strengthened establishment of realistic data requirements. This process enabled confirmation of the availability of required data before the evaluation commenced, data collection to be limited to only required data, and required data to be available for analysis. This was considered to reduce the resource and time required to implement M&E while increasing the quality of M&E.

The three case studies operated in different environments with respect to resource availability. From this, it is clear that the CDE Framework is versatile in terms of resources: the Framework could be effectively applied where resources were extremely constrained and also where resources were relatively unlimited provided the request was seen as reasonable.

**Rigour.**

*Table 26. Summary of findings for CDE Framework’s demonstration of the required rigour across cases.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>CDE Framework’s demonstration of rigour on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supports implementation of rigorous, but not excessive, evaluations with honest findings. While quantitative analysis was often desired, this was not a consistent element of this criterion.</td>
<td><strong>SIGHMP</strong> Supported honest findings as CDE Framework made hiding problems difficult due to clearly defining each element of capacity for each output and outcome level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The M&E System developed on each of the three case studies was identified as being rigorous by all those interviewed (Table 26). The contribution of the CDE Framework to this rigour was clearly identified. On both SIGHMP and AIPEG, the rigour was specifically attributed to having “defined clear and measurable outcomes at the immediate, intermediate, and the end outcome level with partner agencies”. For AIPEG and SIGHMP this was through documentation of the picture of success. As a consequence of this clarity in documentation of the desired end state, there was wide agreement on both initiatives that “It would be very hard to hide any problems” using the CDE Framework. Thus, the reported M&E findings were seen to be honest.

The CDE Framework was also considered to contribute to the rigour of the M&E through ensuring that all outputs and outcomes were considered in the M&E. This was a consequence of application of the Framework preventing the M&E focusing on either the ‘good news stories’ or the more ‘high profile’ aspects of the initiative. Instead, it required assessment of progress in achieving the picture of success for each output and outcome. For each of the three case studies, the methods used to collect and analyse the data were also seen by users to be rigorous. They considered the CDE Framework had contributed to this through the clear identification of data requirements.

Thus, the CDE Framework supported demonstration of rigour in evaluations. This was through establishing clarity in the data requirements and facilitating the comprehensive evaluation of all outputs and outcomes against the specific, agreed picture of success for each.

**Versatility.**

Table 27. Summary of findings for CDE Framework’s demonstration of the required versatility across cases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>SIGHMP</th>
<th>AIPD</th>
<th>AIPEG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicable at different levels of a system; in different sectors and cultures; for different sized agencies; for initiatives of different size, implementation strategy and stage in project life-cycle; enable a variety of</td>
<td>All those who used the CDE Framework concluded it was suitable for SIGHMP. Several have since applied the Framework on other initiatives and in different</td>
<td>Applicable to all capacity development initiatives on AIPD and able to respond to changes in context, approach and priorities Has been applied by AIPD team members to other initiatives in Indonesia and Philippines. Not appropriate for monitoring achievement of</td>
<td>Was applicable to all activities supporting economic governance capacity development in various agencies. Was applicable for M&amp;E of activity and Sub-facility. Has been applied by users to projects undertaken at a University in Indonesia. Other users intend to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The diversity among the cases studied provides clear evidence that the CDE Framework was applicable in a wide range of contexts (Table 27). The cases represented three different aid modalities: project, program and facility. In addition, the value of the initiatives varied from $7 million to almost $70 million and each developed the capacity of different sectors: SIGHMP in housing management; AIPD in rural development; while AIPEG developed capacity in the economic governance sector. These initiatives also successfully applied the CDE Framework at activity, Sub-facility and program level; and at both the design and implementation stages. Finally, each of the case studies used different methodologies for data collection and analysis, indicating that the CDE Framework was neither prescriptive nor dependent upon the particular M&E methodology.

Within each initiative, the CDE Framework proved extremely versatile. For two of the case studies (AIPD and AIPEG), the Framework was successfully applied across a range of different sized activities supporting various public and civil society partner organisations. In addition, these activities encompassed a range of different cultures across Indonesia (AIPD and AIPEG) and Solomon Islands (SIGHMP). As changes occurred in the environment in which the initiatives were applied, the CDE Framework was able to respond to these changes and also the realisation that design assumptions were incorrect. These factors all indicate a high level of versatility.

Most significantly, those who used the Framework believed it was versatile. On each initiative, some users of the Framework had already applied the Framework in different situations including: initiatives funded in different countries and cultures (Afghanistan, Philippines, Papua New Guinea and elsewhere in Indonesia); development assistance programs funded by other donors; programs supporting civil society organisations, education institutions, and government agencies; initiatives of different scale; and as the basis for training team members and partners in evaluation of capacity development. This diversity of application outside the three case studies and users’ strong belief that the CDE Framework could and should be applied elsewhere, strongly underlines the versatility of the Framework.
### Use and usability.

Table 28. Summary of findings for CDE Framework’s demonstration of the required use and usability across cases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>SIGHMP</th>
<th>AIPD</th>
<th>AIPEG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings support use and are provided in a timely manner. Findings can be used to support the partner agency in planning and decision-making; the donor in program planning and implementation of other activities; and communication with stakeholders; and also meet the information needs of the program.</td>
<td>Supported decision making at operational levels. This is possibly through the focus of questions on application of outputs and why outcomes have not been achieved, the Framework’s simplicity supporting frequent application and its explicit nature. There is no evidence that it supported decision-making at strategic levels.</td>
<td>Particularly at a strategic level. This appears to be through the provision of findings that inform decision-making. Supported communication of initiative and M&amp;E with stakeholders through clarity. There is no evidence of supporting partners planning or decision making.</td>
<td>CDE Framework supported usability of M&amp;E. Actual use of findings was dependent on the manager’s attitude to M&amp;E and the findings rather than the CDE Framework. There is limited anecdotal evidence of supporting partners planning or decision-making.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The CDE Framework consistently supported usability by providing the information that addressed the questions in which the implementing team was interested. This was a consequence of providing information at both the activity and outcome level, complemented by information on the processes rather than simply performance. However, on one case study (AIPEG) the Framework did not provide the information AusAID required. This was a consequence of a lack of understanding of the Facility as an aid modality and what AusAID subsequently recognised as their unrealistic expectations about the timeframe in which change could occur.

The provision of this information in a timely manner was also critical in supporting usability. This was particularly the case where the evaluation was undertaken fully by the team without external support (SIGHMP) and was also demonstrated where external M&E expertise was provided. As a result, the information required by managers was available when needed. This is reflected in an AIPD manager’s comment that “Being able to write real things because I have the data is great, it’s all due to the [M&E] system”. Timely provision of information was only possible because the simplicity of the Framework meant that it could be implemented internally.
The extent to which intended users applied the findings reflected their proximity to implementation and involvement in M&E. Those directly involved in the management of the initiative used the findings on all case studies. Thus, on SIGHMP the Sub-Contractor’s team used the findings, on AIPEG findings were used by the managing contractor’s team, and on AIPD by both the AusAID and the managing contractor’s team. AusAID made extensive use of the findings (particularly at a strategic level) where they were directly involved in management (AIPD). However, where they were not involved in management (SIGHMP and AIPEG), their use of findings was limited to meeting the AusAID Post’s reporting requirements to AusAID in Canberra. Consequently, AusAID only used the information from AIPEG for their Quality at Implementation (QAI) reporting. In the case where AusAID managers were removed from implementation by an additional layer of management (SIGHMP), there was virtually no use made of the findings. This also applied to partners. Thus, it was only on SIGHMP, where partners were very proximal to implementation and closely involved in the M&E, that partners used the findings to any significant extent. This use was at an implementation, rather than strategic, level.

These findings have significant implications for the questions asked by evaluations. If use of findings is primarily limited to implementers, then the questions an evaluation addresses should focus on the implementer’s information needs. Consequently the information needs of those outside the initiative are of less significance.

The extent of support for M&E influenced use of findings. For example, use of findings on AIPD and SIGHMP was immediate and extremely high. Similarly use was high in AIPEG sub-facilities where the Lead Adviser supported M&E. However, on sub-facilities for which the Lead Adviser did not support M&E, use of findings was limited. Here, use often had to be forced by senior management. Without this, the findings were neither communicated to partners nor used.

Those who used the findings identified several elements of the CDE Framework that supported use. They consistently identified the Framework’s provision of information through the horizontal component (the results chain), the vertical component (the four elements of capacity development) and the time line. In addition, the simplicity of application of the CDE Framework enabled frequent internal monitoring to be undertaken by the SIGHMP team which provided information in a timely manner.
Summary.

Application of the CDE Framework demonstrated all the characteristics specified by intended users (Appendix G). The ability of the Framework to meet users’ requirements was not influenced by characteristics of the country, initiative design or approach to implementation of M&E. However, the visibility of senior management support and users’ perception towards M&E influenced the use of the findings. In addition, the users’ attitude towards M&E influenced their assessment of the ability of the CDE Framework to demonstrate some of the characteristics intended users required of a framework. Thus, as users’ support for the M&E grew, they reported that the CDE Framework demonstrated the specified characteristics.

KEY EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The CDE Framework provided the information required to answer most of the evaluation questions intended users identified in Phase 1 (Chapter 4). However, the Framework did not specifically support identification of unintended outcomes or changes in the environment that may influence future outcomes (Appendix G). These information needs are discussed below.

What change has occurred?

Table 29. Summary of findings for CDE Framework’s provision of information on change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>SIGHMP</th>
<th>AIPD</th>
<th>AIPEG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstration of planned change in individual’s knowledge, skills and behaviour and the organisation. To a lesser extent, contribution and unintended change.</td>
<td>Change was identified through the clear specification of what was to be achieved (the same as picture of success) and horizontal progression to outcomes. The previous approach had not identified change. Contribution of SIGHMP to change was clear. Data was not collected on identification of unintended outcomes.</td>
<td>Change at output level identified. Limited organisational change and change in service delivery identified because it was too early to see significant change at these levels. Change demonstrated through the horizontal component of the Framework. Too early to identify contribution, but results chain and the causality question are believed to enable this. No evidence whether unintended change is identified.</td>
<td>Change at output and outcome level identified. Change was identified through the results chain and picture of success. The contribution of AIPEG to the change was demonstrated through the results chain. There is no evidence that the CDE Framework contributed to identification of unintended change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Framework consistently identified whether the planned change in individuals knowledge, skills and behaviour and the organisation had occurred. It also identified the contribution of
specific activities to this change. However, there was no evidence to suggest that the CDE Framework identified unintended changes.

The intended users reported that change was identified through defining the horizontal element of the CDE Framework and the picture of success. These two elements encouraged clarity in specification of what was to be achieved which was critical in the effective assessment of whether the planned change had been achieved. As a consequence of using the CDE Framework, this lucidity could be established at the commencement of the initiative (AIPD), early during the initiative (AIPEG) or during the last year (SIGHMP) with good effect to identification of change.

The CDE Framework identified change more effectively than other approaches users had experienced. For example, those who had participated in the preceding phase of AIPD or AIPEG, or the initiative prior to introduction of the CDE Framework (AIPEG and SIGHMP), consistently stated that the approach previously used did not enable change to be identified. They considered that the CDE Framework identified more effectively what change had and had not occurred than approaches they had previously experienced. This indicates that the CDE Framework was better able to demonstrate change or lack of change than other mechanisms formerly used.

Contribution was also identified through the CDE Framework. Users indicated that it was the causality question (the “why/why not” question) which enabled this. In addition, this promoted thinking about contribution. For many, this was a new experience.

While both change and contribution were demonstrated on each of the initiatives, at the time the evaluations were undertaken, AusAID managers on AIPEG stated that the demonstrated change did not provide the information they required. This was a consequence of their lack of understanding that the end outcomes of a Facility are relationships not capacity development. For a Facility, capacity development outcomes are only at the immediate outcome level. These AusAID managers subsequently recognised that their expectations about performance change were unrealistic. The fact that they subsequently applied this Framework in other contexts indicates an overall satisfaction with its ability to identify where the change had or had not occurred.

There is no evidence of the CDE Framework supporting teams to identify unplanned change. Inspection of the Framework indicates that there is no element in the Framework to stimulate
users to consider unplanned change that may have eventuated. Consequently, it is unlikely that the CDE Framework contributed to identifying unplanned change.

In summary, application of the CDE Framework identified the occurrence of planned changes in individual’s knowledge, skill and behaviour and the organisation, and the contribution of the initiative to these changes. These changes and contribution were identified through the horizontal element of the Framework, the picture of success and, in some cases, the causality question. The stage in the project life cycle at which the Framework was introduced was not found to influence its ability to support identification of change. This research found that the aid modality used to implement the initiative did influence the perception of change for these case studies; where a Facility modality was applied, the unrealistic expectation that change at the Sub-facility level could be identified was not overcome.

**Was the capacity development strategy effective?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>SIGHMP</th>
<th>AIPD</th>
<th>AIPEG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did the capacity development strategy work?</td>
<td>Identified whether capacity development strategies were or were not working. This was possibly through the results chain.</td>
<td>Differences in effectiveness of capacity development strategies were identified.</td>
<td>CDE Framework identified whether specific capacity development strategies were effective. This was through results chain, picture of success and the causality question.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For all three initiatives, application of the CDE Framework identified whether the capacity development strategy was effective or not (Table 30). This also included identification of variation in a strategy’s effectiveness across different contexts. Most importantly, use of the Framework enabled early identification of strategies that were not proving effective and implementation of corrective action.

Determination of the effectiveness of the capacity development strategy appears to be dependent on the clear articulation of expected achievements. This is through a combination of the results chain (the horizontal element of the CDE Framework) and the picture of success. When these were not achieved in the prescribed period, those monitoring the activity asked the causality question. Thus, for all three initiatives, application of the CDE Framework enabled determination of whether a capacity development strategy was effective or not.
What is the impact of environmental factors on the program?

Table 31. Summary of findings for CDE Framework’s provision of information on the impact of environmental factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>SIGHMP</th>
<th>AIPD</th>
<th>AIPEG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The impact environmental factors had on progress and achievement of outcomes. Changes in the context that could influence the future direction.</td>
<td>The Framework identified environmental factors impacting outcomes.</td>
<td>The Framework encouraged consideration of environmental factors at the design. It also contributed to identifying environmental factors impacting the program during implementation. This was through the causality question.</td>
<td>The Framework supported identification of the environmental factors that influenced the outcome through the risk analysis and the causality question.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the design process, the causality question in the Framework encouraged the team to identify factors in the environment that could influence progress and achievement of outcomes, and consequently to review the program theory (Table 31). Similarly, during implementation, the Framework directed users to identify what factors in the environment had influenced the outcomes. However, there is no evidence that the Framework stimulated the team to consider changes that could influence future implementation and outcomes. AusAID requires information on changes in context on a continual basis to enable assessment of how these may impact the initiative in the future. Thus, application of the CDE Framework for M&E will not be sufficient to meet their needs in this respect. In order to achieve this, a more proactive approach is required where the environment is continually scanned for changes that may influence outcomes.

What lessons have been learned for this and other initiatives?

Table 32. Summary of findings for CDE Framework’s provision of information on lessons learned.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>SIGHMP</th>
<th>AIPD</th>
<th>AIPEG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lessons that can be applied to improve this and future initiatives.</td>
<td>Through the CDE Framework, the team identified lessons learned for application to SIGHMP and AusAID identified lessons for application to the future initiatives. Lessons learned were dependent on the user’s perception of their responsibility.</td>
<td>Lessons learned for application to this initiative were identified. Identified through progress and then asking the causality question. No evidence of consideration of lessons for application to other initiatives.</td>
<td>Lessons learned were identified. Lessons identified through the risk element.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Across all three case studies, application of the CDE Framework identified positive and negative lessons that could be applied to improve the current and future initiatives (Table 32). This even occurred on a small initiative where the team already had a sound understanding of the project (SIGHMP).

The mechanism identified by users through which these lessons were identified varied. On AIPEG, identification of these lessons was attributed to consideration of risk. However on AIPD, it was a combination of considering progress (reflected in the horizontal element) combined with asking the causality question. In contrast, those on SIGHMP did not articulate the mechanism (and as previously discussed, due to timing of data collection, this was not specifically asked). Nevertheless, those on SIGHMP clearly articulated the contribution of the CDE Framework to identification of lessons.

Across these three case studies, the greater the integration of the M&E System into initiative implementation, the more difficulty those interviewed had in articulating the CDE Framework’s contribution to identification of these lessons. For example, on SIGHMP, where the M&E was introduced in the project’s final year and was therefore a clearly ‘different’ activity; the team recognised lessons identified as a result of information provided through application of the CDE Framework. At the other extreme, M&E was integrated into AIPD to such an extent that the boundaries were visible to few. In this case, although reports acknowledged the contribution of the M&E System to identifying lessons, individuals were less able to do this.

Thus, lessons for internal and external application were identified through application of the CDE Framework. This was through a combination of consideration of risk, the results chain and the causality question. Where the CDE Framework was well integrated into the initiative, users were unable to distinguish which elements of the CDE Framework identified the lessons because it was part of day-to-day activity rather than being separate.
What progress has been made toward sustainable achievement of the objective?

Table 33. Summary of findings for CDE Framework’s provision of information progress towards sustainable achievement of the objective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>SIGHMP</th>
<th>AIPD</th>
<th>AIPEG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has the original objective been achieved and if not, what progress has been made toward its achievement? Can the improvements in organisational performance be continued? Can the improvements in organisational performance be sustained?</td>
<td>Identified partial achievement of the objective and strategies to support full achievement of the objective. This was through the vertical component. Progress and lack of progress were identified through the results chain. The cause of lack of progress was identified through the causality question. CDE Framework provided information on sustainability of outcomes.</td>
<td>Enabled early identification that the objective was unlikely to be achieved and subsequently that it would not be achieved. Both progress and lack of progress were identified, this had not occurred before the CDE Framework was introduced. Progress identified through the timeline, results chain and comparing indicators with the baseline. Information on sustainability was provided through the clear specification of outputs and outcomes at an organisational level. The CDE Framework encouraged a focus on sustainability.</td>
<td>Both progress and lack of progress were identified. Progress was identified through the horizontal results chain. There is limited evidence that the CDE Framework supports answering the question of achievement of objective. Provided information on sustainability of outcomes through the definition of outcomes at different levels with a picture of success, and perhaps the risk component. CDE Framework encouraged some users to consider sustainability who may otherwise not.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was strong evidence across all case studies that the CDE Framework supported both identification of progress and lack of progress, and also the likelihood of sustained improvements in organisational performance (Table 33). Those involved in each of these case studies also identified that this had not been possible with the previous M&E approach. In addition, some managers also identified that they had not seen progress successfully monitored on other initiatives.

Information on progress was provided through movement along the results chain combined with use of the picture of success describing the end point for each output and outcome. The same information contributed to information on sustainability of improvements in organisational performance. However, in this case, the focus was on expected changes in organisational performance as defined at the intermediate outcome level. Combined with the picture of success, users considered that this enabled them to make an informed judgement
about sustainability. In addition, the concurrent consideration of the risks associated with achieving this outcome encouraged some users to increase their focus on sustainability.

The CDE Framework also provided information on achievement of the objective for each case study. However, a Facility is designed to develop relationships between donors and partners and improve donor’s ability to influence policy (Dawson, 2009) rather than to have performance or capacity outcomes at either a Sub-facility or Facility level. However, in AIPEG’s case, both the goal and objective were defined as improvements in capacity and performance at a national or agency level. Therefore neither the goal nor the objective specified in AIPEG’s design could be achieved using this aid delivery modality. Consequently, the failure to identify achievement of the objective was a design issue rather than an issue with either implementation or the CDE Framework.

Thus, this research found that the CDE Framework provided the required information on progress and can provide information on sustainability. However, the information on sustainability is perhaps not as direct as information in relation to other key evaluation questions. This is because it is drawn from anticipated achievement of change in organisational performance combined with risk assessments and consequently involves greater individual judgement.

Summary.

The CDE Framework supported provision of information to answer all questions intended users had identified (Table 34). All elements of the CDE Framework contributed to generating the information intended users required. For example, the results chain (the horizontal component of the Framework), defining output, immediate intermediate and end outcome; combined with the picture of success, contributed to identifying changes that had occurred because of the initiative, progress towards the objective, and sustainability of organisational change. The causality question had encouraged those implementing the M&E to consider why different capacity development strategies had or had not worked and what changes in the environment had influenced the initiative. All elements of the Framework contributed to providing the information required; however, the vertical component (UNDP’s four elements of capacity) was perhaps the least consistently used to provide information.
Table 34. Performance of CDE Framework in line with intended users’ criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intended users criteria</th>
<th>Performance Information</th>
<th>Process Information</th>
<th>Demonstrating the characteristics specified by intended users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Providing the required information</strong></td>
<td>What has changed?</td>
<td>What progress has been made toward sustainable achievement of the objective?</td>
<td>Was the capacity development strategy effective?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ Change at output and outcome level identified through use of horizontal component and picture of success.</td>
<td>✓ Both progress and lack of progress were identified through the horizontal component and picture of success.</td>
<td>✓ Identified whether capacity development strategies were or were not working through the horizontal component, picture of success and causality question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>× Unintended change was not identified.</td>
<td>✓ The cause of lack of progress was identified through the causality question.</td>
<td>✓ The CDE Framework identified environmental factors impacting outcomes through the causality question and risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ Identified contribution through horizontal component and causality question.</td>
<td>✓ CDE Framework provided information on sustainability of outcomes through the horizontal component and picture of success at an organisational level.</td>
<td>× The Framework did not encourage consideration of how changes in these factors may impact the initiative in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Encouraged increased focus on sustainability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intended users criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirements limited.</td>
<td>✓ Realistic data requirements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigour</td>
<td>✓ Supported rigorous evaluations through the specification of clearly defined, measurable outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Versatility</td>
<td>✓ Applicable to each case study and all capacity development activities within them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Able to respond to changes in context, approach and priorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Has been applied by members of each team to other initiatives with other agencies and in other countries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use and usability</td>
<td>✓ CDE Framework supported usability of M&amp;E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Supported use through provision of required information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual use of findings was dependent on the manager’s attitude to M&amp;E and the findings rather than the CDE Framework.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were only two elements of a question where the CDE Framework did not provide all the information intended users requested. These were: (i) the unintended changes that occurred because of the initiative; and (ii) changes in the environment that may influence the initiative in the future. Inspection of the CDE Framework indicates it contains no elements that specifically target these areas of information. Consequently, it is not surprising that the Framework did not encourage M&E to address these two sub-questions.

For each case study, the Framework was able to provide the required information in relation to capacity development. However, where goals and objectives were not those of capacity development, the Framework did not provide the performance and capacity development information AusAID anticipated at a Facility level. Instead, in accordance with the aid modality chosen, this information was provided at an activity level. Beyond this, the ability of the Framework to provide the required information was independent of characteristics of the country, initiative design or approach to implementation of M&E.

Thus, across all case studies, use of the CDE Framework largely provided the information intended users required. In addition, intended users identified that it did this more effectively than previous approaches they had experienced. This ability of the Framework to provide the information required had then contributed to use of findings.
ALTERNATIVE EXPLANATIONS

Following introduction of CDE Framework into each of these initiatives, stakeholders identified significant improvement in M&E. However, these improvements may have been a consequence of factors other than the Framework itself. This research investigated whether the CDE Framework or other factors contributed to this improvement.

To investigate the contribution of alternative explanations to the improvement in M&E, interviews specifically addressed the influence of potential alternative explanations for the findings. Alternative explanations were identified through comparison of the characteristics of the case studies and as analysis of data occurred. The possible alternative explanations identified related to: management of the initiative (senior management support and whether the Program Director was contracted by AusAID or the managing contractor), AusAID’s M&E capacity (both the introduction of the M&E Standards in Indonesia and the training for AusAID staff), the time in the project life cycle at which introduction of the CDE Framework occurred, the period available for developing an understanding of M&E among the team, and the level of resources available for M&E (Table 35). A discussion of each of these elements follows.

Management of the initiative, as a possible alternative explanation, is comprised of two factors: senior management support and the employing agency for the Program Director. Senior management support for M&E was strong on each case study. However, AIPEG senior management support was not clearly visible and the middle management support for M&E was variable. This lack of support detracted from the effectiveness of AIPEG’s M&E. In contrast, the depth and visibility of such support assisted implementation of the M&E on AIPD. However, in neither case did this influence the CDE Framework’s ability to either demonstrate the characteristics required, or provide the information intended users specified in Phase 1. Given that the Framework was effective in both situations with and without strong visible management support, it is unlikely this factor would account for the outcomes related to application of the CDE Framework across these case studies.
Table 35. Summary of alternative explanations for improvements in M&E.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Factors</th>
<th>SIGHMP</th>
<th>AIPD</th>
<th>AIPEG</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Management support for M&amp;E</td>
<td>Very high management support from Team Leader, but no support from external management.</td>
<td>Very high and visible senior and middle level management support.</td>
<td>No contribution to CDE Framework meeting the user requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Program Director a member of AusAID staff</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
<td>While there are communication benefits, these appear to impact on use of findings rather than implementation of the M&amp;E.</td>
<td>No contribution to CDE Framework meeting the user requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Introduction of AusAID M&amp;E Standards</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
<td>Consistency of Standards was perceived as a benefit; however, MST identified that the M&amp;E System would have been the same without the Standards.</td>
<td>No contribution to CDE Framework meeting the user requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AusAID’s M&amp;E capacity</td>
<td>AusAID’s Evaluation Capacity Development Program</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
<td>The AusAID staff involved with AIPD did not participate in the capacity development activities.</td>
<td>No contribution to CDE Framework meeting the user requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage of project life cycle at which Framework was introduced.</td>
<td>CDE Framework was introduced in the last year of the Project.</td>
<td>Introduced before activity design began. This strongly influenced the ability of the CDE Framework to provide benefit at a strategic level and to activity design.</td>
<td>M&amp;E (including CDE Framework) introduced after Facility had been operating for one year</td>
<td>Does not account for CDE Framework meeting the user requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Factors</td>
<td>SIGHMP</td>
<td>AIPD</td>
<td>AIPEG</td>
<td>Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to develop understanding of M&amp;E</td>
<td>Development of M&amp;E System occurred in parallel with raising understanding of M&amp;E over a 1 month period.</td>
<td>Increased team members knowledge of M&amp;E and reduced their fear of M&amp;E.</td>
<td>Developing understanding of M&amp;E occurred over approximately three months in parallel with development of M&amp;E system.</td>
<td>Strengthens M&amp;E, but does not account for CDE Framework meeting the user requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of team in M&amp;E</td>
<td>Very little training conducted.</td>
<td>Increased team members knowledge of M&amp;E and their reduced fear of M&amp;E has supported the effectiveness of the M&amp;E System.</td>
<td>Supported the M&amp;E, but was very limited.</td>
<td>Strengthens M&amp;E, but does not account for CDE Framework meeting the user requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resourcing for M&amp;E</td>
<td>No resources were provided for M&amp;E</td>
<td>Presence of a full-time, national evaluation expert was a key factor in the effectiveness of the M&amp;E System.</td>
<td>Relatively low level of resourcing. The full-time M&amp;E position was not an expert in M&amp;E. This introduced some constraints for the M&amp;E system.</td>
<td>No contribution to CDE Framework meeting the user requirements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Program Director was a member of AusAID’s staff on AIPD, whereas he was engaged by a managing contractor on both AIPEG and SIGHMP. Across all those interviewed for both AIPD and AIPEG, there was no evidence to suggest that the Program Director’s employment relationship contributed to AIPD’s improved M&E. However, AIPD managers believed that this relationship did assist application of findings at a more strategic level. This was because they could be more honest in reporting and there was a shorter communication line to strategic decision makers.

Thus, as the CDE Framework was found to be effective regardless of the contracting relationship with the Program Director, this factor is unlikely to account for the improved M&E outcomes reported.

AusAID’s M&E capacity, both the introduction of the M&E Standards in Indonesia and the training for AusAID staff, was also considered as a possible alternative explanation for the results. In Indonesia (AIPD and AIPEG), team members considered that AusAID’s management had improved because of introduction of M&E Standards and training through AusAID’s Evaluation Capacity Development Program. However, none of those interviewed considered this had influenced the M&E System’s ability to meet users’ criteria; instead, they believed it improved communication between AusAID and other team members. In addition, few AIPEG and AIPD AusAID managers participated in the training and those who did, generally undertook this toward the end of their role on the initiative. Consequently, it is unlikely that this influenced the improved M&E on either of these initiatives. Further, the Standards were not introduced into Solomon Islands nor was the training program conducted during this period. Thus, there is no evidence that either of these factors contributed to the CDE Framework meeting user requirements.

The time in the project life cycle at which the CDE Framework was introduced was also analysed as a possible alternative explanation. In terms of M&E, there were significant benefits identified by introducing the CDE Framework early in the initiative’s life (Chapter 7). However, this did not influence the CDE Framework’s ability to improve the M&E on an initiative. Regardless of whether the Framework was introduced before activity design (AIPD), early in the initiative (AIPEG), or only in the last stages of the initiative’s life (SIGHMP), M&E improved after the Framework’s introduction. Therefore, it is unlikely that the stage in the program life cycle at which the CDE Framework was introduced accounts for the improvements in the M&E or its ability to demonstrate the characteristics and provide the information users identified in Phase 1 of this research.
Across all three cases, the variance in time users had to gain an understanding of M&E, the extent to which they received training in M&E and the level of resources available demonstrates that these factors were not related to the results reported. For example, at one extreme, SIGHMP had no resources allocated to M&E and team members received little M&E training. At the other extreme, AIPD received all the resources they reasonably requested, had the presence of a full-time national evaluation expert and significant time for training team members. In addition, team members had a year to develop an understanding of M&E before its introduction. In addition, those interviewed clearly stated that while these factors may have helped or hindered the initiative’s M&E, the CDE Framework accounted for the improved M&E and enabled provision of the required information while meeting most of the characteristics specified in Phase 1.

In conclusion, while some of the possible alternative explanations identified may have contributed to improvements in M&E, it is unlikely that any of them account for either the improved M&E in these case studies or the M&E system demonstrating the characteristics and providing the information that those interviewed in Phase 1 identified.

CDE FRAMEWORK’S ABILITY TO ADDRESS WEAKNESSES IN EVALUATIONS OF CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT

As shown in the literature review, numerous weaknesses in evaluations of capacity development have been identified by many writers (for example, Bamberger, 2000; Carmen, 2007; DANIDA, 2010; Taut, 2007; UNDP, 2008; WBI, 2011; WFP, 2009). These weaknesses are summarised in Box 7. This research found that, across the three case studies, use of the CDE Framework contributed to addressing all of these weaknesses.

A common weakness (Box 7, point 1) identified was the failure to clearly distinguish between outputs and outcomes. However, the CDE Framework directly addresses this through the structure of the Framework and the definitions used for each level of output and outcome. In fact, the ability to distinguish between outputs and outcomes was frequently identified as a strength of the Framework.
Box 7. Summary of weaknesses in evaluation of capacity development identified in the literature review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluations of capacity development need to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.</strong> Promote an outcomes focus – clearly distinguish outputs and outcomes and move the focus upward from inputs and outputs to outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.</strong> Establish agreed initiative expectations. Establish clear and agreed expectations about the initiative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.</strong> Use relevant indicators - Establish agreed, inclusive indicators that focus on both outcomes and progress in areas that can be influenced and which measure progress and results in measures other than changed performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.</strong> Establish realistic M&amp;E expectations about what an evaluation can achieve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.</strong> Adopt a duality of purpose - Consider both the outcomes and the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.</strong> Address audience needs. Consider the information needs of different audiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7.</strong> Maintain flexibility rather that rigidity within the evaluation framework.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The clarity in definitions of outputs and outcomes also helped shift the focus from inputs and outputs, to outcomes – specifically how the output will be applied and help to achieve the end outcome\textsuperscript{cdxcvii}. For many involved in the initiative, this outcomes focus was a new experience\textsuperscript{cdxcviii}. This is reflected in the following comment, typical of the experience of those with a government background:

> In the government, we … only thought about inputs and activities rather than outputs and outcomes, which are really the most important thing. The Framework made me see that outputs and outcomes are most important. Based on this framework I can clearly see these high levels, it is very clear to design an activity.\textsuperscript{cdxcix}

Those with a consulting background expressed a similar position:

> This is a different element to what we did before. Before we mapped who will use the output, rather than what actually happens; what we did was theoretical rather than what really happens. Now we have to look at what happens.\textsuperscript{d}

At a management level, it drew attention to the implications on outcomes of changes in inputs. For example, a member of the SIGHMP managing contractor’s team recognised that:

> If the Solomon Islands Maintenance Adviser wasn’t appointed, the old report would just be that there was no Solomon Islands Maintenance Adviser, so we wouldn’t mobilise an
adviser and there would be no further inputs. With the new reporting, you can see the
implications of not having the person in place and the consequences for the Solomon
Islands Government.

Partners saw this focus on outcomes and the capacity development process as being a key
element to support sustainability. As a result, some partners were encouraging other donors
to adopt a similar approach.

The clarity achieved in differentiating outputs and outcomes and establishment of a clear
linkage in activity designs between inputs, outputs and outcomes were also reported as a major
factor in improving the quality of activity designs. This was reflected by an internal review of
implementation of AIPEG's M&E System reporting that activity design had improved through
“greater clarity between outputs and outcomes, and the indicators are more appropriate ... (and
adoption of) an integrated approach to the design of activities”.

In turn, when applied during activity design, this clarity established clear and agreed
expectations about the initiative, including what would be achieved and when (Box 7, point 2). Subsequently, during implementation, the diagrammatic representation of the CDE Framework clarified expectations by providing a means to effectively communicate the Program with stakeholders. For example, one AusAID manager explained, “The CDE Framework is used by staff to clearly inform the government about the program concept and profile. It is easier for the government to understand the aim and how [the Program] will assist them. As a result, across both AIPD and AIPEG there was a greater understanding among partners and team members of activities that the initiative could support than prior to application of the CDE Framework. This produced numerous benefits. For example, it established clear and simple selection criteria for activities; focussed selection of activities on contribution to outcomes and the agency's long-term plan; and provided partners with a better understanding of activities that could be supported, the rationale for requesting additional information to support a proposal and why some proposals were rejected. As explained by an AusAID manager, the CDE Framework was central in supporting this change:

Without the M&E Plan, people who work in the field will accept requests from the
Government of Indonesia without considering capacity development and the long-term
perspective of how this can be achieved.
Across all three case studies, those who had worked on the initiative (or its predecessor) prior to the introduction of the CDE Framework, noted this clarity had not previously existed. In particular, the Framework provided a basis for clarifying with contractors what they would produce, the quality criteria and timelines. This was well described by a team member who reported:

We weren’t really clear about what we were going to achieve on [the previous program]; what we would measure. So we focused on the inputs. It was not clear how the activity would direct us to the outcome. It was also not clear for the partners what we would achieve. We did have the design, but the linking of activities to the outcome was unclear.

Through the picture of success, the CDE Framework established realistic, agreed indicators for progress and success (Box 7, point 3). Combined with the lucidity about expectations of what the initiative could achieve, and this clarified expectations about what could be evaluated (Box 7 point 4). This was because “People can see the different levels and timeframes involved. They can see the change can’t occur overnight and different activities have different time frames” and “we can talk to external reviewers and stakeholders about what blocks moving to the next level”. This was described on both AIPD and AIPEG as “one of the most valuable things [the CDE Framework] does”.

While the CDE Framework did clarify expectations, maintaining realistic expectations about an initiative’s achievements and what could be evaluated, proved elusive. As previously discussed, all partners applied the CDE Framework to the activity design process to agree and document what each activity within the AIPD and AIPEG could achieve, when this would occur and what could be evaluated. In addition, all partners had specifically agreed that AIPD could not realistically achieve change in service delivery during the Program’s life. However, when senior AIPD AusAID management changed, concern emerged that AIPD was not, and would not, demonstrate changes at the service delivery level within the Program life. There was a demand that this occur. Similarly, on AIPEG, within a year of implementation, AIPEG’s AusAID managers noted, “The difficulty is that you don’t see the change at the service delivery level, at the long term level”. This concern was driven by the AusAID Activity manager’s perceived need to report at a service delivery level and a lack of understanding of the Facility as an aid modality.
The increased outcomes focus shifted attention to also consider the capacity development process and the effectiveness of capacity development strategies (Box 7 point 5). As a result, focus was on use of outputs rather than merely their production as reflected in the following adviser statement:

After we train people on budgeting we now monitor whether people use the output and how they use it and whether they influence others to use it. Before we weren’t really concerned with this. … [Before] after training we didn’t provide assistance and support for people to do it … Now we provide the assistance and support and also do the M&E. 

As demonstrated in this quote, this attention to process led to changes in the support provided. Other advisers reported that as a result of introducing the CDE Framework they considered the need for strategies to address constraints in networks or the enabling environment. For each of these initiatives, it was the vertical element of the Framework that encouraged consideration of a range of different capacity development strategies and the causality question that encouraged consideration of their effectiveness.

As discussed earlier in this chapter, the CDE Framework supported use of findings through providing the information that the intended users needed (Box 7 point 6). Thus, although the CDE Framework specifies the key evaluation questions, these questions better meet the information needs of stakeholders than do the DAC Criteria. Consequently, while not fully addressing consideration of the audience’s information needs, the CDE Framework does help provide the information needed by different audiences.

The CDE Framework supported a flexible M&E system (Box 7 point 7). This was best demonstrated on AIPD where the CDE Framework was able to respond to changes in the environment and the realisation that design assumptions were incorrect. However, inflexibility is often argued as a limitation of M&E systems based on program logic despite the intent that they be applied in a dynamic fashion (Dart, 2006, Dunlop and Sawadogo, 1997 (quoted in den Heyer, 2001); Gale et al, 2006; McLaughlin and Jordan, 1999; Mosse et al., 1996). Consequently, the actual flexibility of any M&E system is likely to be a function of users perspectives rather than design of the system.

Thus, application of the CDE Framework across each of the case studies had addressed many of the weaknesses identified in previous evaluations of capacity development. In particular, where the Framework was applied during the design phase (AIPD and AIPEG), teams indicated that the
“designs are much more targeted and focussed”. As the Independent Review stated, this was reflected in “greater clarity between outputs and outcomes, ... indicators are more appropriate ... [and adoption of] an integrated approach to the design of activities. Fundamentally, the CDE Framework:

shone light on what is often seen as a “black box” in program design, the means to describe and analyse the critical middle steps linking activities and outputs through to immediate, intermediate and end of program outcomes.

Clearly, use of the CDE Framework helped address the weaknesses identified with evaluations of capacity development. However, the Framework alone will not resolve all issues with capacity development evaluation practice. Other factors, in particular perception of users, will influence capacity development evaluation practice.

SUMMARY OF CROSS-CASE ANALYSIS

Application of the CDE Framework across all three case studies demonstrated most of the characteristics specified by intended users and supported provision of the information intended users had required. In addition, users consistently considered that the CDE Framework improved the quality of the initiative’s M&E. Application of the CDE Framework also successfully addressed a number of factors that have limited the frequency with which evaluations of capacity development occur. This was through addressing individual and organisational level capacity constraints, and providing a framework specifically for the evaluation of capacity development. In addition, use of the CDE Framework addressed the weaknesses previously identified in evaluations of capacity development. None of the alternative explanations for these improvements were found to account for these findings.

From this evidence it is clear that use of the CDE Framework provided significant assistance to evaluation of capacity development on each of these three case studies. The ability of the CDE Framework to address the weaknesses identified in previous evaluations of capacity development, combined with the breadth (in terms of diversity of individual users and case studies) and depth (through prolonged engagement with each of these case studies) of data collected supports the transferability of these findings (Falk & Guenther, 2007; GAO, 1990; Popay et al., 1998). However, of even greater significance to transferability, is the audience’s perception (Falk & Guenther, 2007). Participants of each of the workshops believed that the findings were transferable and users of the Framework on each case study had already applied
the Framework in other contexts, clearly reflecting their belief in the transferability of findings. Transferability will also be supported by the generalisation of findings to a theory in Chapter 7 on how evaluation frameworks assist evaluation of capacity development (Byrman, 2012; Mitchell, 1983).
Discussion and Conclusion
CHAPTER 7. CONTRIBUTION OF CDE FRAMEWORK TO EVALUATION OF CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT

This project aimed to improve the evaluation of capacity development on development assistance initiatives through addressing the overarching research question:

Does application of one of the available frameworks assist the evaluation of capacity development initiatives? If so, how does it do this?

Research and practice in the field of international development recognises capacity development as central to achieving sustainable alleviation of poverty. As a consequence, there is high donor expenditure in capacity development initiatives. However, despite this focus, capacity development outcomes are poor and in some cases, capacity development initiatives have undermined progress towards poverty alleviation (Jabeen, 2014; World Bank, 2005). To date, evaluation findings have provided little if any value in improving this situation because they are rarely conducted, and those implemented are generally of poor quality. The consistent quality issues include a lack of: focus on outcomes, clear expectations of either the initiative or the M&E, relevant indicators, consideration of process, and flexibility; and failing to address audience needs (DANIDA, 2010; Forss et al., 2008; Fukuda Parr et al., 2002; Ministry of Foreign Affairs [MoFA] Netherlands, 2011; Oxford Policy Management, 2006; Taut, 2007; WBI, 2011; WFP, 2009). A number of factors may have contributed to the poor evaluation outcomes including the lack of: consistency in definitions of capacity and capacity development; individuals with the required skills; and models, systems and policy to support M&E of capacity development (Carman, 2007; La fontaine, 2000; UNDG, 2006; Watson, 2006). As a result, the need for a unique framework for evaluation of capacity development has been acknowledged (Lusthaus et al., 1999).

This research sought to identify the questions and characteristics required in a framework for evaluating capacity development, and whether the CDE Framework (Figure 4) was a useful model for this task. To do this, the research first conducted a needs assessment. This phase involved interviewing over 60 people who design, implement or use the findings from evaluations of capacity development. These interviews were analysed to identify the information the evaluation needed to provide and the characteristics the framework should demonstrate. The findings were presented to all those interviewed and the broader group of intended users for review and comment.
This first phase of the research found that the information required by users broadly fell into two categories; (i) reflecting information on capacity (ability – demonstrated as performance), and (ii) on the capacity development (process). Thus, despite the lack of agreement and debates on definition of capacity and capacity development (ADB, 2008; Austrian Development Agency, 2011; OECD-DAC, 2009), this study demonstrated that users require information on both (Chapter 4). Therefore, while wide-scale agreement on these definitions may not be achieved in the near future, in practice, this may be more of an issue of semantics. Addressing the questions of both performance and process would meet most users’ needs.

The criteria intended users identified were then compared to the DAC Criteria, currently the most widely used criteria for evaluating capacity development. This found there was limited overlap between the two; the criteria identified in this research were broader than those specified in the DAC Principles and the DAC Standards (Figure 5), the implications of which are discussed later. Thus, the criteria currently most widely used for evaluating capacity development do not meet users’ needs. Consequently, the criteria identified in Phase 1 formed the basis for testing the CDE Framework.

Phase 2 of this research then considered whether application of the CDE Framework met these needs. To determine this, the research applied a case study approach to three AusAID funded initiatives that included as much variation as possible in terms of characteristics and implementation (Chapter 5). Following this, a cross-case analysis was completed which also (i) considered whether the CDE Framework addressed the weaknesses in evaluations of capacity development identified in the literature, and (ii) investigated the alternative explanations for the findings (Chapter 6). Through this process, the research demonstrated that the CDE Framework met the needs users identified in Phase 1, and addressed the weaknesses in evaluation of capacity development identified in the literature. Therefore, the CDE Framework is a tested model for evaluation of capacity development.

This chapter will discuss the findings from Phase 1 and Phase 2 and their implications for some of the strategic issues in relation to evaluation of capacity development. These include the debate over the definition of capacity development, the ongoing relevance of the DAC Criteria as the basis for evaluations in the international development sector and the use of other frameworks for evaluation of capacity development. The chapter also identifies revisions to the
CDE Framework that would improve its application in the future. Based on this discussion, a revised CDE Framework is presented in Figure 8.

**Figure 5. Comparison of the DAC Criteria and Principles and findings of this research.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Users’ requirements</th>
<th>Correlates with</th>
<th>OECD DAC Criteria and Principles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What has changed?</td>
<td>⇔</td>
<td>What is the initiative’s impact?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What progress has been made toward sustainable achievement of the objective?</td>
<td>⇔</td>
<td>What is the initiative’s effectiveness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What is the initiatives sustainability?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the impact of environmental factors on the initiative?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What lessons have been learned for application to this initiative?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What lessons have been learned for application to other initiatives?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the capacity development strategy effective?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not included in CDE Framework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigour</td>
<td>⇔</td>
<td>What is the initiative’s efficiency?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What is the initiatives relevance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use and usability</td>
<td>⇔</td>
<td>Credibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Impartiality and independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to understand</td>
<td></td>
<td>Usefulness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to use</td>
<td></td>
<td>Participation of donors and recipients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic Resource Requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Versatility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THE VALUE OF THE FRAMEWORK**

Does application of one of the available frameworks assist the evaluation of capacity development initiatives?

As previously discussed, this research found that application of the CDE Framework assisted the evaluation of capacity development initiatives. This conclusion was based on consistent findings across each of the three case studies that the CDE Framework:

- Provided the information users required; and
- Demonstrated the characteristics considered necessary in a framework for evaluating capacity development (Figure 6).
In addition, use of the CDE Framework provided a number of other benefits (Figure 6). These were that users considered it:

- Overcame many of the weaknesses previously identified with evaluations of capacity development;
- Overcame their fear of M&E;
- Improved the quality of evaluations; and
- Improved the quality of designs when applied during the design process.

**Figure 6. Schematic diagram showing CDE Framework performance against intended users’ criteria.**

The value of the CDE Framework was also demonstrated by the almost universal agreement among users that application of the CDE Framework had improved the quality of evaluations in comparison to their previous experience; and the large number of users who had already applied, or intend to apply, the Framework to different initiatives. Clearly, application of the CDE Framework did assist the evaluation of capacity development initiatives.

**How did the CDE Framework assist evaluation of capacity development?**

The CDE Framework’s ability to meet users’ needs and the benefits produced were a consequence of each element of the CDE Framework rather than a single aspect. These seven elements comprise: the horizontal results chain, the picture of success for each output and outcome, the time at which each output or outcome will be achieved, a vertical component
comprising the four capacity development elements identified by UNDP, the causality question (the why, why not question), the risks associated with achieving outputs and outcomes and the key evaluation question for each output and outcome level (Figure 4). The contribution of each of these elements to assisting evaluations of capacity development is summarised in Figure 7 and discussed below.

Figure 7. Contribution of each element of the CDE Framework to assisting evaluation of capacity development.

The horizontal element comprises four elements: the output; and immediate, intermediate and end outcomes (Figure 4). The Framework specifies a clear definition for each of these elements; outputs are a product and immediate outcomes the application or use of the output. Consistently, users identified that these explicit definitions provided a clarity about what the initiative was doing and what it sought to achieve. The definitions also underpinned the ease with which people were able to understand and use the Framework. Consequently, the definitions were perhaps the most critical element of the Framework.
This clarity was supported by the qualitative (and where possible quantitative) picture of success which documented the agreed end state for each output and outcome. Combined with the specific time frame, making lucid when outputs and outcomes should be achieved, users considered that they had a sound understanding of the initiative, something they had not previously experienced.

Together these three elements (the horizontal component, picture of success and timeframe) enabled evaluations to provide most of the required performance information. In particular, having a specific output or outcome, with a well defined description of success, consistently enabled determination of change and measurement of progress toward the next outcome level. The process of developing and communicating these three elements also contributed to establishing clarity and a common understanding among stakeholders about the initiatives.

Achievement of clarity and shared understanding generated realistic expectations among stakeholders (Figure 6). This was because “People can see the different levels and timeframes involved. They can see the change can’t occur overnight and different activities have different time frames.” Consequently, users on both AIPD and AIPEG described this as “one of the most valuable things [the CDE Framework] does.”

While the CDE Framework did clarify expectations about the initiative, maintenance of realistic expectations proved elusive. For example, on both AIPEG and AIPD, partners had agreed during the activity design process that change in service delivery could not be achieved until the initiative’s final year. Despite this agreement, following a change in AusAID Activity manager and the perceived need to report at a service delivery level, concern arose that the initiative was not demonstrating change at the service delivery level. This concern was accompanied by the demand for demonstration of change at a service delivery level. Thus, perceived reporting requirements drove expectations about the change evaluations should demonstrate, and consequently the initiative and the evaluation failed to meet the needs of donors. Clearly, this is outside the scope of what a framework can contribute to the evaluation of an initiative.

Clarity in M&E was established by the simple key evaluation question in the Framework for each output and outcome level and the causality question. These enabled specification of what the evaluation would consider (and when) at the commencement of an activity. Establishing this clarity in the M&E’s boundaries helped overcome fear of M&E and the perception that it was judging the adviser rather than the activity (Figure 6).
Clarity of M&E was instrumental in the Framework’s ability to demonstrate many of the other characteristics intended users required. For example, users considered use of findings was supported by the focus on application of outputs and why outcomes were not achieved. They also believed that the clarity in M&E enabled data required for M&E to be identified at the start of the initiative, and then collected. This minimised resource requirements by only collecting required data and improved rigour by enabling required data to be identified and collected.

In contrast, information on the capacity development process was largely provided through the causality question, and consideration of the vertical and risk elements (Figure 6). In particular, the causality question was a significant contributor to provision of the information intended users required. This element of the CDE Framework encouraged consideration of the program logic and identified the contribution of the initiative to the demonstrated changes. In addition, along with other elements of the CDE Framework, it was found to encourage consideration of lessons learned, the impact of environmental factors on the initiative and whether the capacity development strategy was effective.

Intended users less frequently identified the contribution of the risk element of the Framework to providing the information they required (Figure 6). During the design process, the risk element encouraged consideration of environmental factors that may affect achievement of the outcomes. Subsequently, during implementation the retrospective consideration of risk identified lessons learned.

The vertical component of the CDE Framework was designed to focus on process by encouraging consideration of a greater breadth of capacity development strategies; strategies that targeted the individual, entity, network and enabling environment (UNDP, 1997) rather than just the individual (Kotvojs, 2009). As many users had a weak understanding of capacity development, and consequently of this dimension of the Framework, the application of the vertical element on AIPD and AIPEG was limited. However, where the vertical element was applied (SIGHMP), it encouraged attention to different capacity development strategies and provided information on their effectiveness.

Thus, through a combination of each of the seven elements that comprise the CDE Framework, the Framework has provided a significant level of assistance to the evaluation of capacity development initiatives. This was a consequence of its simplicity; the Framework is easy to
understand and apply. Through this, it has provided clarity to, and facilitated shared understanding of, both the initiative and M&E.

The criteria that a framework be easy to understand and use may seem self-evident, however numerous authors report that managers often perceive complexity as positive (Buckingham, 2005; Collins, 2001; Pfeffer and Sutton, 2000). They warn that this constrains an individual and organisation’s ability to act. In particular, simplicity helps overcome anxiety about action (Buckingham, 2005). Consequently, a simple framework will facilitate implementation, and as Perrin (2001) presented, often provides the most useful information.

Establishing a shared understanding of the planned future state has been identified as “create[ing] a sense of commonality that permeates the organization and gives coherence to diverse activities” (Senge, 1990, p. 206) which in turn, underpins generation of a commitment to change. Consequently, shared understanding is critical for promoting action leading to change (Medez-Morse, 1993; Nanus, 1992; Richardson et al., 2014; Stufflebeam, 2000; Wakeford, 2010). This has led these and other authors to identify clarity about an initiative or an evaluation as the critical factor in implementing the activity and achieving the planned outcomes. Since the purpose of developing capacity is to enable a change, the significance of establishing a shared understanding cannot be over emphasised.

Many of the benefits that accrued to AIPD and AIPEG from applying the CDE Framework were a consequence of applying it during the design process. Given the importance of shared understanding in facilitating change, this is easily understood. However, when the CDE Framework was only applied towards the end of the project (SIGHMP), stakeholder understanding of the initiative was also promoted. This also encouraged action specifically focussed on achieving change at the outcome level. Thus, while application of the CDE Framework at the design stage is ideal, its application later in the project life still achieved many of the same benefits.

Establishing a shared vision has been identified as a key strategy to generate trust and overcome fear (Richardson et al., 2014; Senge, 1999; Wakeford, 2010). Use of the CDE Framework was found to reduce fear of M&E (Figure 6). Thus, the establishment of a common understanding through use of the CDE Framework may be the way in which the CDE Framework is contributing to overcoming users’ fear of M&E.
The process used to develop this shared understanding has also been identified as critical to its ability to change attitudes of individuals and the organisation (for example, Benade 2012; Mendez Morse; 1993; Rogus 1990; Senge 1990; Westley & Mintzberg, 1989). Within this research, two case studies (AIPD and SIGHMP) used a highly participatory approach, involving extensive discussions with all stakeholders. In contrast, the approach AIPEG used involved minimal stakeholder dialogue over a short period of time. This difference in process may have contributed to the difference in intended users’ commitment to M&E demonstrated across initiatives.

Not only is the process used to develop the shared vision critical, but so to is the clarity with which the vision is documented (Mendez-Morse, 1993; Rogus, 1990; Senge, 1990). In line with this concept, the CDE Framework captures the shared vision diagrammatically through the horizontal component of the Framework, the picture of success and the time frame. This proved to be a clear and concise way to encapsulate the agreed vision. Authors such as Richardson et al. (2014) and Wakeford (2010) proposed that this clarity would promote effective communication. This was reflected in the experience of each case study where they used the diagrammatic presentation of this shared vision to successfully communicate with others. Thus, the clarity in understanding combined with the way in which it was documented supported effective communication.

The users concluded that the CDE Framework provided the information they needed. Numerous researchers have long reported the necessity of evaluations providing information relevant to the decisions being made if they are to be used (for example, from Guba & Stufflebeam, 1970 to Liket et al., 2014). However, evaluations have failed to do this (for example Cook & Gruder, 1978; Lawrence & Cook, 1982). Not only must evaluations provide the needed information, but, as Perrin (2001, p. 253) identified, they must focus on users’ critical information needs. The CDE Framework achieved this through providing information on change, the only information need identified by all intended user groups, in addition to both performance and process information.

Together, the elements that comprise the CDE Framework have established a simple framework for M&E of capacity development. This simplicity underpins the CDE Framework’s ability to successfully address many of weaknesses identified in previous evaluations of capacity development. In particular, it has provided clarity to, and facilitated shared understanding of, both the initiative and M&E. Through this clarity and shared understanding, a number of
additional benefits have emerged encompassing changing attitudes, focus, behaviour and ultimately, use of findings. Over time, this can be expected to contribute to improve capacity development outcomes.

**CDE Framework’s potential to address factors that limit occurrence of evaluations of capacity development.**

The literature review identified that evaluations of capacity development rarely occurred. Writers such as Carman (2007), La fontaine (2000), UNDG (2006) and Watson (2006) have attributed this to a lack of capacity at the individual and organisational levels, and a lack of policy, systems and models to support evaluation of capacity development. The findings from this research suggest that use of the CDE Framework can contribute to addressing these constraints.

Individual capacity comprises knowledge, skills and attitudes (UNDP, 1997). Thus, use of a framework that addresses limited capacity in these three elements of individual capacity should improve the frequency and quality of evaluations. As discussed in Chapter 6, the CDE Framework was found to be easy to understand and to use, and could be applied without significant M&E expertise. These characteristics of the Framework will help address the lack of M&E knowledge and skills at the individual level.

In addition, this research found that the CDE Framework contributed to changing many stakeholders’ attitudes to M&E. As a consequence of their previous M&E experiences, many had been left confused and uncertain, with the belief that M&E failed to add value, and in some cases, they were left “haunted”. However, using the CDE Framework changed these attitudes as reflected in the statement of an adviser that M&E:

> Was scary before, but it is not now ... we didn’t do M&E [on the previous program] because we didn’t know what the success looks like, ... [now] monitoring lets us see the problems and what we can’t achieve, we can then get it running.

Likewise, use of the CDE Framework changed the attitude of the donor’s managers as demonstrated by an AusAID manager’s statement that:

> I personally have been very frustrated by M&E in the past. Actually, I thought it was a bullshit field. Now on this program, I see what it can do; wow! I am suddenly passionate
about it when I can see what it can do. I really like it because I have an ordered logical way of thinking. ... I took a stronger interest because of what the M&E can do.\textsuperscript{dxxxv}

This change in attitude was achieved through the Framework’s simplicity of language, the clarity it brought to initiative design and its ability to provide the information required by users.\textsuperscript{dxxxvi}

At an organizational level, lack of visible senior management support for M&E had a major adverse influence on the level of support for M&E across an initiative, the extent of application of M&E and the ease of implementation of an initiative’s M&E system. However, as described previously in this section, the CDE Framework provided these managers with timely information that enabled them to identify and address emerging issues. Through this, as shown in the previous quote, formerly unsupportive senior manager’s became M&E champions on both AIPD and AIPEG. Thus, the CDE Framework facilitated generation of visible senior management support for M&E.

The other factor identified by the literature as contributing to lack of M&E of capacity development and the poor quality of such evaluations was the lack of policy, systems and models to support evaluation of capacity development. While the Framework does not provide a policy or specific systems in support of M&E of capacity development, it does provide a model to apply to evaluate capacity development. This contributes to overcoming obstacles at an organisational level to evaluation of capacity development.

Clearly, from the analysis earlier in this chapter, the CDE Framework did provide a model that when applied, provided most of the information and demonstrated most of the characteristics intended users required. In particular, the Framework provided clarity about M&E, was easy to use, overcame users’ fear of M&E and demonstrated the value of effective M&E to an initiative. Thus, application of the CDE Framework helped overcome some of the factors leading to few evaluations of capacity development occurring.

THE NEED FOR A NEW APPROACH

The CDE Framework was found to add value to evaluations of capacity development. Its use provided the information users required and addressed many of the weaknesses of evaluations undertaken using the DAC Criteria. In contrast, use of the DAC Criteria provides only part of this (Figure 5) and the DAC Principles do not capture the critical elements related to simplicity, and consequently do not facilitate clarity about either the initiative or the M&E, a shared
understanding or agreed expectations. This may be a significant contributor to the poor quality and limited use of evaluation findings.

The failure of the DAC Criteria and Principles to consider information on process or elements related to simplicity may be a consequence of their history; the developers of the DAC Criteria represented only one of the stakeholders; bilateral and multilateral agencies (Chianca, 2008a). In contrast, this research sought input from all stakeholder groups who required evaluations of capacity development to provide information on both capacity (ability as demonstrated in performance) and capacity development (process). Whereas those who developed the DAC Criteria identified a suite of performance-focussed criteria that excluded criteria related to the capacity development process. Thus, the DAC Criteria do not meet the broader spectrum of users’ information needs. This has significant implications for the relevance of findings from these evaluations, and therefore their use by stakeholders.

Numerous authors have shown that to maximise use, intended users should define the evaluation question (for example, Cook and Gruder, 1978; Guba et al., 1970; Patton, 2008; Perrin, 2001). However, the DAC Criteria were defined by only one user group; one unlikely to use the evaluation findings for a range of structural and attitudinal reasons. For example, senior DFAT managers interviewed were not aware of a formal mechanism for communication of evaluation findings to decision makers and most lacked confidence in the objectivity of internal evaluations. This lack of confidence and formal communication mechanism constrains the likelihood of findings from internal evaluation informing strategic decisions.

If it is unrealistic to expect that the findings of internal evaluations will inform higher, strategic levels of decision-making, the value of defining the evaluation questions against the DAC Criteria is highly questionable. Clearly, commissioners should define the evaluation questions to reflect the information needs of those who will use the findings. Based on this research, this would be those involved in the implementation of the evaluation, who need information on performance and process.

The reliance on the DAC Criteria is likely to become a greater constraint to quality evaluations within the international development sector as the predominance of capacity development as an approach to development assistance initiatives grows. This is because capacity development is a process, rather than an endpoint, and, as identified by both this research and that of Chianca (2008a), the DAC Criteria do not consider process. Perhaps the recent inclusion of
statements on a number of websites raising concern about the exclusive use of the DAC Criteria reflects a growing awareness of the issues with the DAC Criteria (BetterEvaluation, http://betterevaluation.org/evaluation-options/dac_criteria; Raab, 2013).

Thus, because DAC Criteria remain the most widely used evaluation questions among bi- and multi-lateral donors (AusAID, 2013b), terms of reference for most evaluations in the international development sector (and more specifically capacity development initiatives) do not capture the information needs of intended users. In this context, it is not surprising that there is a high level of dissatisfaction with evaluations of capacity development and their quality is generally poor. Therefore, the almost unquestioning focus on DAC Criteria and Principles may be contributing to the poor quality of evaluations of capacity development, and possibly more broadly of evaluations of development assistance initiatives across the sector. As adoption of a capacity development approach increases, the use of the DAC Criteria is likely to constrain even further the value of evaluations of capacity development. Consequently, a different approach to evaluation of capacity development should be considered.

REFINEMENT OF THE CDE FRAMEWORK

This research demonstrated that use of the CDE Framework to support evaluations of capacity development improved evaluation outcomes for each of the three case studies. Users believed that these findings were transferable and that the CDE Framework would provide a better basis for evaluations than current approaches. Consequently, many users have already applied the CDE Framework in different contexts and others plan to apply the Framework in the future.

To further improve outcomes from application of the CDE Framework, this research has identified refinements to the Framework to address the identified weaknesses. These refinements all reflect a change in terminology and are discussed below. A modified Framework is presented in Figure 8.

The first change is in relation to the terminology used for one of the four elements of capacity development. There was confusion amongst some users over the term “enabling environment” resulting from the current focus of many donors on climate change. Consequently, some users associated the term “environment” with “climate change” and thought that this was directing them to consider how climate change related to the activity. To avoid this confusion, the term “enabling environment” could be changed to “Enabling context”.
The remaining change is to encourage proactive consideration of how changes in the context may influence future implementation and outcomes. As identified in Chapter 6, the Framework does not include any elements that specifically encouraged consideration of the way in which contextual changes may influence future initiative implementation and outcomes. A separate question is not required as this can be addressed in the section considering risk. For example, changing the word “risk” to “risks and contextual changes that may affect future output and outcome delivery” or similar, should overcome this weakness.

The Framework did not specifically consider unintended change. This could be addressed by expanding the key evaluation question to include the statement “and what else has changed?” Fundamentally this would introduce a goal free element. However, the work of Scriven (1991) and Welch (1978) suggests that introduction of goal free elements may undermine a key benefit of application of the CDE Framework; reducing fear of M&E. Scriven reported that some team members would perceive the goal free approach as a threat because all elements of the evaluation are essentially outside the initiatives’ control. While he noted that this should not lead to assignment of blame, he recognised the reality that many would be concerned that this blame may be assigned. This was confirmed by Welch’s experience that stakeholders became suspicious and anxious about the evaluation where a goal free approach was used. From the available literature it is not possible to determine whether this is a common concern as other reviews of application of a goal free evaluation did not consider the approach’s limitations (for example, Youker, 2013; Youker & Ingaham, 2013; Youker et al., 2014). Thus, further work would be required to determine whether the Framework would be improved if modified in this way.

Given the significant improvement seen in evaluations using the CDE Framework over previous approaches, application of this refined model (Figure 8) should support better evaluation outcomes. Not only will the approach contribute to provision of the information required by intended users, its simplicity is likely to improve attitudes to M&E. In addition, through its role in clarifying and establishing a shared vision, the Framework should support the change process.
LIMITATIONS OF THIS RESEARCH AND FUTURE RESEARCH

There are a number of limitations associated with this research. These are related to the design and implementation of the research, and expectations about what a Framework can realistically achieve. Each of these limitations is discussed below.

This study included intended users from all user groups for each of the three case studies. However, the number of users interviewed from partner agencies was limited for Phase 2 for reasons outside the control of the research. While providing the conclusions to all those interviewed from partner agencies in both Phase 1 and 2 (and a small number of other partners who had expressed interest) for comment, will have partially addressed this, it has not overcome this limitation. Consequently, the extent to which the conclusions capture partner’s perspective is less than desired.
This research has demonstrated the value of application of the CDE Framework; it has not considered the application of the other frameworks now available. However, it is plausible that the critical factor is the use of any framework, rather than a specific framework. Perhaps many of the benefits found from using the CDE Framework were simply a consequence that there was a simple M&E plan. If this is the case, application of the specific evaluation framework that most closely reflects the conceptual approach to capacity development used by the initiative may be most suited. Further research is needed to test the application of the frameworks now available and determine the contexts in which each is most suitable.

This research also found that user’s perceptions were significant in how evaluation findings were used. The individual’s perception of their responsibilities on the initiative and their reporting requirements influenced the way in which findings were used. Therefore, it is unrealistic to expect findings from any evaluation to be applied where the users perceptions are not aligned with broader expectations associated with use. This will always remain a limitation to use of findings.

In the process of answering the research questions, this research also identified a number of limitations associated with application of the DAC Criteria to evaluations of capacity development. With these limitations, it is uncertain whether the DAC Criteria are improving or compromising the quality of evaluations of capacity development. Despite this, there appears to be no research as to whether the DAC Criteria are contributing to improving the quality of evaluations or initiatives. Thus, the findings from this study would suggest further research is also required into the continued relevance of the DAC Criteria.

**CONCLUSIONS**

This research has clearly demonstrated that the application of the CDE Framework assists the evaluation of capacity development initiatives. This is through the simplicity of the Framework which facilitates clarity and shared understanding, and provision of both performance and process information. In addition, the research has addressed a number of areas in the literature where there has been an absence of information (Table 36).
Table 36. Knowledge gaps which this research has helped overcome.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extensive searches of the literature could not identify:</th>
<th>This research:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Users’ needs having previously been identified.</td>
<td>• Established the information users of evaluation findings want evaluations to provide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Any publicly available findings on tests of frameworks for evaluation of capacity development.</td>
<td>• Identified the characteristics a framework for evaluation of capacity development must demonstrate to meet users’ needs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Showed that the CDE Framework:

• Largely provides the information and demonstrates the characteristics users require.
• Addresses many of the weaknesses the literature identified with evaluations of capacity development.
• Is likely to improve M&E outcomes.

Thus, at the completion of this research we know that the application of the CDE Framework assists the evaluation of capacity development initiatives. This is through the ease with which it can be understood and applied and its provision of information on both performance and process; simplicity is critical. We also know that the DAC Criteria do not meet the information needs of users. Research is required to determine whether they remain relevant or are even undermining the quality of evaluations. In addition, other frameworks for evaluation of capacity development now available should be tested. The findings from this research have the potential to contribute to significant improvements to evaluations of capacity development initiatives through improved activity design and implementation.
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Appendices
APPENDIX A. DONOR POLICY DOCUMENTS AND GUIDELINES

A review of 12 bilateral donors indicated that all used the DAC criteria for evaluations. While several donors identified that other criteria could also be used (SIDA, NZAID, DANIDA), few required the use of other criteria (AusAID included gender and equality and UKaid included additional criteria in a humanitarian context) or identified what such criteria may be (Austria Development Cooperation, CIDA). SIDA stated that no DAC criteria could be excluded and a number of bilateral donors (Austria Development Cooperation, UKaid) specifically stated that if any of the DAC criteria were not used, this must be justified.

Most bilateral donors did not consider evaluation of capacity development in their policy or evaluation guideline documents. A small number referred to capacity development in the example of evaluation questions (Austria Development Cooperation and Norad). Austria Development Cooperation identified a range of approaches for evaluation of capacity, and only JICA and DANIDA specifically required the evaluation of capacity development where this was relevant.

This contrasts the situation for the multilateral donors. Unlike the bilateral donors, only one of the multilateral donors considered (the European Commission), referred to specific evaluation criteria. In addition, each specifically identified evaluation of capacity development in their guidelines or policy documents in some way. For some, this was simply by inclusion of examples of evaluation questions relating to capacity development (ADB and the European Commission). Others referred to a capacity development as being one potential theme where a thematic approach was being taken to evaluation.

In the last five years, the World Bank and UNDP have both introduced specific models for evaluation of capacity development.

Donor policy and guideline documents reviewed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Policy or guideline document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australian Agency for International Development</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>M&amp;E Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria Development Cooperation</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Guidelines for Project and Programme Evaluations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Policy or guideline document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Evaluation Guide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>CIDA’s Policy for Performance Review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>undated</td>
<td>Framework of Results and Key Success Factors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>undated</td>
<td>Accountability – Danida’s Evaluation Feed-back.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deutsche Gesellschaft fur Internationale Zusammenerbeit (GIZ)</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>M&amp;E policy GIZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingdom of Belgium</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Evaluation of NGO partnerships aimed at capacity development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Results-Oriented Approach to Capacity Change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Danida Evaluation Guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>undated</td>
<td>Evaluation of Development Cooperation Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Activity Evaluation Operational Policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Results Management in Norwegian Development Cooperation. A practical guide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Assessment of Sustainability Elements/Key Risk Factors : Practical Guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Policy or guideline document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>From Good Principles to Better Practice. An OECD-DAC Perspective on Capacity Development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>The Evaluation of the Paris Declaration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>undated</td>
<td>DAC Criteria for Evaluating Development Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>undated</td>
<td>Summary of Key Norms and Standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for International Development (UK)</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>International Development Evaluation Policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations Development Program</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>The Evaluation Policy of UNDP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>The Capacity Development Results Framework. A strategic and results-oriented approach to learning for capacity development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B. SEMI STRUCTURED INTERVIEW GUIDES.

PHASE 1: USER REQUIREMENTS FROM EVALUATION OF CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT

Preparation (complete prior to interview)

Interviewee name _____________________________ User group: ____________

- Interviewee has received a Plain Language Statement?  
  (tick one)  Yes  No
- Interviewee has returned a consent form?  
  (tick one)  Yes  No

If either are no, do not proceed. Complete these first.

Introduction

Introduce yourself; explain the purpose of this specific interview.

Questions for Stage 1

1. What is your experience in evaluation of donor funded capacity development programs? 
   (This should include their general role, whether capacity development was evaluated or ignored, whether they feel it is generally well done).

2. What was one particular program that evaluated capacity development?

3. Thinking of this particular capacity development program:
   - At what stage in the program life cycle was the evaluation undertaken: design, implementation, completion, or post completion?
   - What was the purpose of the evaluation?
   - What was your role on the program and with the evaluation?
   - Who was the Managing Contractor?
   - How was the evaluation planned? (Include whether an external adviser was used, who was involved in the process, how they were involved, who documented the plan, how the plan was documented, how comment on the plan was gained, who approved the plan, whether it was linked with planning of activities or discreet, was the approach based on a particular framework/model).
   - How was the evaluation implemented? (Include whether an external adviser was used, who collected and analysed data, when this occurred, what data collection and analysis methods were used.).
   - How was the evaluation used? (Include how the findings were reported and to whom, how the findings were used).
   - What were the strengths and weaknesses of this approach from your perspective?

4. How would you define capacity development?

5. What do you want evaluation of capacity development programs to be able to tell you?

6. What frameworks/models for evaluation of capacity development are you aware of?

7. By what criteria would you assess the usefulness of a framework for evaluation of capacity development programs?

   (If the interviewee was involved in a number of evaluations of capacity development programs, Question 3 should be asked for each)
**Conclusion Stage 1**

Thank the interviewee for their time. Explain the next stage (as per Plain English Statement). Confirm the interviewees willingness to participate in the next stage.

- Interviewee is willing to participate in the next stage? (tick one) ☐ Yes ☐ No

If not, thank the interviewee and confirm that a copy of the findings for stage 1 and the final results for the research will be provided for them. Interview is completed.

If willing to proceed, explain that we have a few questions to ask to enable the research to be structured to best meet their needs.

**Questions to Plan Stage 2**

8. In collecting data on your experience in using the Framework, what are the best ways to collect this data from you? (Consider where they will be, availability of time, preferred mode of communication. Different methods may be journals, interviews, questionnaires.)
PHASE 2: EXPERIENCE WITH THE CDE FRAMEWORK

Preparation (complete prior to interview)

Interviewee name _____________________________ User group: ____________

- Interviewee has received a Plain Language Statement? (tick one) Yes No
- Interviewee has returned a consent form? (tick one) Yes No

If either are no, do not proceed. Complete these first.

Identify the stage of design and implementation of M&E now. Only ask questions relevant to that stage.

Introduction

Introduce yourself; explain the purpose of this specific interview.

Background

1. How do you work with AIPD/AIPEG/SIGHMP?
2. How do you define capacity development?
3. What do you want evaluation of capacity development programs to be able to tell you?
4. By what criteria would you assess the usefulness of a framework for evaluation of capacity development programs?
5. Were you involved in planning how the M&E of AIPD/AIPEG/SIGHMP would occur? If so, how were you involved?
6. Were you involved in implementing M&E on AIPD/AIPEG/SIGHMP? If so, how were you involved?
7. Were you involved in using the findings from M&E of AIPD/AIPEG/SIGHMP? If so, how were you involved?

(Then only ask questions relevant to answers to Q5 - 7)

Design of M&E

- How was the M&E Plan for AIPD/AIPEG/SIGHMP developed? (consider who was involved and their roles, time taken, approach)
- Were there ideas/concepts that were particularly easy/difficult to understand? If so, what were they?
- How is M&E on AIPD/AIPEG/SIGHMP intended to relate to activity implementation? (Separate/integrated, for improvement, integration of cross-cutting issues & sustainability)
- How is the M&E for an individual activity planned? (Consider when, who is involved, links to other activities and overall M&E Plan, flexibility, rigour)
- How could the planning for the M&E on AIPD/AIPEG/SIGHMP be improved?
- Should the M&E tell you (If not, was this considered in the planning of the M&E):
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- What has changed as a result of the activity? (look for changes in behaviour, organisation and service delivery)
- What individuals/organisations are able to do or what is being done differently?
- The factors in the environment that influenced the change?
- How well the capacity development strategy is/is not working?
- Lessons learned for AIPD/AIPEG/SIGHMP/other activities?
- Progress towards the outcomes?
- Achievement of the Program’s objective?
- Sustainability of benefits
- (also check other items identified in Q3)

**Implementation of M&E**

- Who collects the data/analyses the data/reports the findings for M&E of an activity?
- How much time would you/others spend on implementation of the M&E for an activity? Is this too much/little for the information you gain?
- What is easy/complex about M&E on AIPD/AIPEG/SIGHMP? Why? *(look for language, concepts, time,* …)*
- What other resources are required to implement the M&E for an activity?
- How could the implementation of the M&E on AIPD/AIPEG/SIGHMP be improved?

**Use of Findings**

- Who are provided with the findings of the M&E? How do you expect them to use the findings?
- How do you use the findings of the M&E?
- Do the findings answer the questions you want to know about the activity? What do you want to know that the M&E doesn’t provide?
- Does the M&E tell you (if so, what are some examples):
  - What has changed as a result of the activity? (look for changes in behaviour, organisation and service delivery)
  - What individuals/organisations are able to do or what is being done differently?
  - The factors in the environment that influenced the change?
  - How well the capacity development strategy is/is not working?
  - Lessons learned for AIPD/AIPEG/SIGHMP/other activities?
  - Progress towards the outcomes?
  - Achievement of the Program’s objective?
  - Sustainability of benefits
  - (also check other items identified in Q3)
- How confident are you in the findings and recommendations from the M&E? Why? How could your level of confidence be improved?
Application of the CDE Framework to the Evaluation of Capacity Development Initiatives

- What has changed as a result of using the findings of the M&E of AIPD/AIPEG/SIGHMP?
- How could the use of the M&E on AIPD/AIPEG/SIGHMP be improved?

Other Frameworks

- Would you use this approach to evaluate capacity development activities in the future? Why/why not?
- What frameworks/models for evaluation of capacity development are you aware of?
- How does this experience compares with evaluation approaches used within other capacity development programs.

Conclusion

Thank the interviewee for their time. Explain the next stage (as per Plain English Statement). Ask whether the interviewee is willing to be interviewed again in about 4 months

- Interviewee is willing to participate in future interviews? (tick one)  Yes  No

If not, thank the interviewee and confirm that a copy of the findings for this stage and the final results for the research will be provided for them. Interview is completed.
PHASE 2: FINAL INTERVIEW EXPERIENCE WITH THE CDE FRAMEWORK

1. Implementation of M&E
   - What is easy/complex about M&E on AIPD/AIPEG/SIGHMP? Why? (look for language, concepts, time, ....)
   - What is easy/complex about the CDE Framework?
   - How much time would you/others spend on implementation of the M&E for an activity? Is this too much/little for the information you gain?
   - Were the resources required to implement the M&E for AIPD/AIPEG/SIGHMP reasonable? Why/why not?
   - Does the M&E tell you (If so, what are some examples):
     - What has changed as a result of the activity? (look for changes in behaviour, organisation and service delivery)
     - What individuals/organisations are able to do or what is being done differently?
     - The factors in the environment that influenced the change?
     - How well the capacity development strategy is/is not working?
     - Lessons learned for AIPD/AIPEG/SIGHMP/other activities?
     - Progress towards the outcomes?
     - Achievement of the Program’s objective?
     - Sustainability of benefits
   - How could the implementation of the M&E on AIPD/AIPEG/SIGHMP be improved?

2. Use of Findings
   - Who are provided with the findings of the M&E? How do you expect them to use the findings?
   - How do you use the findings of the M&E?
   - Do the findings answer the questions you want to know about the activity? What do you want to know that the M&E doesn’t provide?
   - How confident are you in the findings and recommendations from the M&E? Why? How could your level of confidence be improved?
   - What has changed as a result of using the findings of the M&E of AIPD/AIPEG/SIGHMP?
   - How could the use of the M&E on AIPD/AIPEG/SIGHMP be improved?

3. Other explanations
   - Do you think ECBP influenced M&E on AIPD/AIPEG? If so, how?
   - Do you think the level of resourcing influenced M&E on AIPD/AIPEG/SIGHMP? If so, how?
   - Do you think having an AusAID/Managing Contractor Program Director would influence M&E outcomes? If so, how?
• Do you think the amount of time available for planning AIPD/AIPEG/SIGHMP and designing an activity influenced M&E? If so, how?

4. **Other Frameworks**
   • Would you use this approach to evaluate capacity development activities in the future? Why/why not?
   • What frameworks/models for evaluation of capacity development are you aware of?
   • How does this experience compare with evaluation approaches used within other capacity development programs.
PHASE 2: SIGHMP EXPERIENCE WITH THE CDE FRAMEWORK

As data was collected from SIGHMP for Phase 2 before analysis for Phase 1 was completed, the following series of topics were used as a basis for interviews. This list was based on the literature review and issues emerging as Phase 1 data was collected.

Possible topics for data collection

1. Experience using the Framework during design of the M&E Plan. This will consider the strengths and weaknesses of its use in relation to:
   - Time and resource requirements to implement the Framework.
   - Contribution to clarity in design.
   - Contribution to understanding of the program.
   - Integration of cross-cutting issues.
   - Integration of evaluation.
   - Sustainability of the framework.
   - Simplicity/complexity of use.

2. Experience using the Framework during implementation of the program. This will consider the strengths and weaknesses of its use in relation to:
   - Time and resource requirements to implement the Framework.
   - Information provided (timeliness, relevance, effectiveness and efficiency).
   - Identification of ways to improve program outcomes.
   - Use of findings.
   - Integration of cross-cutting issues.
   - Integration of monitoring evaluation.
   - Simplicity/complexity of use.

3. Experience using the Framework during evaluation. This will consider the strengths and weaknesses of its use in relation to:
   - Time and resource requirements to implement the Framework.
   - Information provided (timeliness, relevance, effectiveness and efficiency).
   - Use of findings.
   - Integration of cross-cutting issues.
   - Simplicity/complexity of use.

4. How this experience compares with evaluation approaches used within other capacity development programs.
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AUDITOR’S LETTER OF ATTESTATION

This letter of attestation is in relation to an inquiry audit into the thesis titled:

An Examination of Evaluation of Capacity Development: Application of the Capacity Development Evaluation Framework

Submitted by: Fiona Kotvojs

The purpose of the audit, carried out at the end of the research, is to ascertain and verify the accuracy of the use of interviewee references. The auditor was provided with the final draft of the thesis together with interviewee summary notes completed by the researcher.

The audit involved selecting random interview codes from a spreadsheet provided by the researcher. The researcher then forwarded those notes to the auditor and a selection of these was checked against the references and quotations in the text. All references pertaining to the 17 selected interview notes were checked. In total over 150 references were checked.

The interviews were 2DIG2, 2DIPK2, 2EL, 2ELG, 2MPTHX2, 3ELG, 2ELK, 4ELK, 5ELK, ALK5, ALK6, ALS, CLG3, CLS2, CLSX3, ELG, TASX2.

I felt that the thesis accurately captured the views expressed in the interviews.

All quotations were found to be accurate. In a few cases the references referred to interviews from the same person but a different interview (as some people were interviewed more than once). These have subsequently been amended by the researcher.

As auditor, I testify that the interviewee references in the text that I have checked are true and accurate.

Anne Lockley
Monitoring and Evaluation Consultant
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APPENDIX D: PLAIN LANGUAGE ENGLISH STATEMENT

PLAIN LANGUAGE ENGLISH STATEMENT FOR INDIVIDUALS

Invitation

You are invited to participate in a research to test a framework for evaluating capacity development programs. This research is being conducted by Fiona Kotvojs as part of a Doctorate of Education (Evaluation and Assessment) at the University of Melbourne. The research is being supervised by Associate Professor Rosalind Hurworth through the Melbourne Graduate School of Education. This research has been approved by the relevant ethics committees at the University of Melbourne and in (name of country/organization).

Background

Capacity development is core to the activities supported by most development assistance agencies. However, capacity and the development of capacity are rarely evaluated. Where they have been evaluated, the quality of evaluations has often been poor and capacity development was found to be largely unsuccessful. Given the current and expected future focus on capacity development in international development initiatives, there is an urgent need for a simple, clear framework to support the monitoring and evaluation of capacity development of international development assistance initiatives. This research will seek to provide this by testing whether a particular framework supports quality evaluations of capacity development projects. If you would like to read more about this Framework, a paper can be accessed at http://www.aes.asn.au/conferences/2009/Papers/Kotvojs,Fiona.pdf.

A case study approach will be applied to two or three international development projects which have a capacity development focus. AusAID, (name of the partner agency) and (name of the Managing Contractor) have agreed for (name of project) to be one of these case studies. We are inviting you to be involved within the context of (name of project).

Methodology

The research will use a utilisation focussed evaluation approach. With this focus, the specific, relevant decision makers and others who will use research findings are identified. It is their values and culture that are used. It is they, rather than the evaluator, who judges the merit and worth of the program. You have been selected as one of the intended users.

If you agree to participate, the types of data we will collect from you may include:

- The key questions you would want answered by this research.
- Your experience in implementing the Framework.
- The relevance of the information for you from the evaluation.
- Your experience in using information from the evaluation.
- What you see as strengths and weaknesses of the Framework in terms of its support to conducting quality evaluation of the Program.
- How this Framework compares with other models.
- How the use of this Framework compares with other approaches you have experienced.

Your participation will be completely voluntary. You can withdraw from the research, or withdraw any unprocessed data at any time.

The data will be collected using methods agreed with you and other participants. It is likely that these methods will include: semi-structured interviews, journals kept specifically for this research, group interviews, World Café and email application of the Delphi technique. We estimate that this will require approximately 6 – 10 hours each year of your time over the next two years.
At the end of the research, the findings will be provided to you and published more broadly in academic papers and at relevant conferences for application across the international development sector.

We intend to protect your anonymity and the confidentiality of your responses. To achieve this, all data will be kept in securely locked cabinets and a password protected computer. Your name and contact details will be kept in a separate password protected file to the data you provide. This information will only be available to the researchers involved. In the final report you will be referred to by a pseudonym (unless you request otherwise). However, given that the number people participating from (name of project) will be relatively small, it is possible that some people may guess your identity. The data will be destroyed five years after the research is completed.

If you would like to participate in this research, please indicate that you have read and understood this information by signing a copy of this letter and returning it to Fiona Kotvojs by email to fiona.kotvojs@bigpond.com or by post to 701 Dignams Creek, Narooma, 2546 NSW, Australia. Fiona will work with you to agree a mutually convenient time to meet and commence collection of data.

Should you require any further information, or have any concerns, please do not hesitate to contact Fiona Kotvojs (fiona.kotvojs@bigpond.com or (61) 2 6493 6080). Should you have any concerns about the conduct of this research, you are welcome to contact Fiona’s supervisor, Associate Professor Rosalind Hurworth [r.hurworth@unimelb.edu.au] or (61) 3 8344 8624. You may also contact the Executive Officer, Human Research Ethics, The University of Melbourne (61) 3 8344 2073 (phone) or (61) 3 9347 6739 (fax).

Consent:

I agree to participate in this research.

Signature: _________________________

Name: _________________________

Position: _________________________
PLAIN LANGUAGE ENGLISH STATEMENT FOR EACH CASE STUDY

Invitation

(Name of Project) is invited to participate in a research to test a framework for evaluating capacity development programs. This research is being conducted by Fiona Kotvojs as part of a Doctorate of Education (Evaluation and Assessment) at the University of Melbourne. The research is being supervised by Associate Professor Rosalind Hurworth through the Melbourne Graduate School of Education. This research has been approved by the relevant ethics committees at the University of Melbourne and in (name of country/organization).

Background

Capacity development is core to the activities supported by most development assistance agencies. However, capacity and the development of capacity are rarely evaluated. Where they have been evaluated, the quality of evaluations has often been poor and capacity development was found to be largely unsuccessful. Given the current and expected future focus on capacity development in international development initiatives, there is an urgent need for a simple, clear framework to support the monitoring and evaluation of capacity development of international development assistance initiatives. This research will seek to provide this by testing whether a particular framework supports quality evaluations of capacity development projects. If you would like to read more about this Framework, a paper can be accessed at http://www.aes.asn.au/conferences/2009/Papers/Kotvojs,%20Fiona.pdf.

A case study approach will be applied to two or three international development projects which have a capacity development focus. We are inviting (name of project) to be one of these case studies. Before (name of project) is included, we will obtain approval from each of AusAID, the partner agency (name of organization) and the Managing Contractor (name).

Methodology

If relevant organisations agree to (name of project) being one of the projects used as a case study, the research will use a utilisation focussed evaluation approach. With this focus, the specific, relevant decision makers and others who will use research findings are identified. It is their values and culture that are used. It is they, rather than the evaluator, who judges the merit and worth of the program. The intended users will include: managers and implementers of (name of program), AusAID internal evaluation specialists and evaluation specialists contracted to AusAID.

If it is agreed that (name of project) may be one of the projects used as a case study, we will invite managers and implementers of (name of program) to participate. Their participation will be completely voluntary and each individual will be able to withdraw at any time.

The types of data we will collect from those on (name of project) who are directly applying the Framework will include:

- The key questions they would want answered by this research.
- Experience in implementing the Framework.
- How the use of this Framework compares with other approaches they have experienced.
- What they see as strengths and weaknesses of the Framework in terms of its support to conducting quality evaluation of the Program.

The types of data we will collect from those using findings from the evaluation of (name of project) will include:

- The key questions they would want answered by this research.
- The relevance of the information for them from the evaluation.
- How the use of this Framework compares with other approaches they have experienced.
- Experience in using information from the evaluation.
The data will be collected using methods agreed with the participants. It is likely that these methods will include: semi-structured interviews, journals kept specifically for this research, group interviews, World Café and email application of the Delphi technique. We estimate that this would require approximately 6 – 10 hours each year over the next two years from those who agree to participate.

We will provide you with a six-monthly update on research progress and any preliminary findings. At the end of the research, the findings will be provided to all participants and published more broadly in academic papers and at relevant conferences for application across the international development sector. Your organization’s approval will be sought before academic papers are published or conference papers presented on this research.

We would prefer to be able to identify (name of project) in all published documentation. However, if you request that the project remain confidential, we will keep the project confidential. However, given that there are only a small number of AusAID funded capacity development programs, it is possible that some people may guess the project.

All data will be kept in securely locked cabinets and password protected computer. It will only be available to the researchers and will not be used for any other purpose. The data will be destroyed five years after the research is completed.

If you would like (name of project) to participate, please indicate that you have read and understood this information by signing a copy of this letter and returning the copy to Fiona Kotvojs by email to fiona.kotvojs@bigpond.com or by post to 701 Dignams Creek, Narooma, 2546 NSW, Australia. Fiona will work with you to invite people from your organization who are intended users of the results of this research to participate and establish the research schedule.

Should you require any further information, or have any concerns, please do not hesitate to contact Fiona Kotvojs (fiona.kotvojs@bigpond.com or (61) 2 6493 6080). Should you have any concerns about the conduct of this research, you are welcome to contact Fiona’s supervisor, Associate Professor Rosalind Hurworth (r.hurworth@unimelb.edu.au or (61) 3 8344 8624). You may also contact the Executive Officer, Human Research Ethics, The University of Melbourne (61) 3 8344 2073 (phone) or (61) 3 9347 6739 (fax).

______________

Consent:

I agree to (name of project) being included as a case study in this research.

Signature: _________________________

Name: _________________________

Organisation: _________________________

Position: _________________________
APPENDIX E. SAMPLE OF CODING OF DATA.

EXAMPLE OF SUBCODING FOR SIMPLICITY OF FRAMEWORK

Complexity of ideas.

D1_Criteria for model - simple to understand_2_TEXT_5150,5324_D1.txt

Source Material:

Is easy to understand. If you have the most beautiful monitoring and evaluation system but it is not easy to understand, it won’t be useful to the program or to the partner.

D12_Criteria for model - simple to understand_1_TEXT_11275,11382_D12.txt

Source Material:

The extent of sophistication of the model—it may have too many bells and whistles, just churning out PH D’s.

DIE__Criteria for model - simple to understand_2_TEXT_11789,12377_DIE.txt

Source Material:

That it is not too complex for people to be able to keep the whole framework in their head. I am only interested in frameworks that people can remember and not have to go back to a textbook. If it is overly complex, I am not interested. It needs to be small in terms of conceptual complexity and absolute size.

DIE__Criteria for model - simple to understand_2_TEXT_12666,12720_DIE.txt

Source Material:

It is always the simple theories that survive overtime.

EN_Criteria for model - simple to understand_1_TEXT_9972,10031_EN.txt

Source Material:

It can’t be so philosophical that it can’t be implemented.

MP_Criteria for model - simple to understand_1_TEXT_10958,11452_MP.txt

Source Material:

The main thing is that it has to be usable, it can’t be scary, most frameworks and models in the development sector scare people. It has to be pitched at the right level to serve the partner’s needs, it must be realistic about what it is doing. It must not be doing too much and it must not be too narrow. It can’t require highly trained experts to use it, maybe that is more monitoring, it must be able to be used by people on the programme not just specialist monitoring and evaluation people.

MPA_Criteria for model - simple to understand_1_TEXT_12192,12591_MPA.txt

Source Material:

It has to be quite practical. Evaluation of capacity development is basically a pretty difficult thing to do. Patricia Lyons model was flawed or not complete, but it was easy to apply. It was a good starting point for us. I compare it to some of the things that XXX has done, and they’re almost impossible to understand, they were highly theoretical and rarely worked in implementation.
It must be easy to understand and apply, before it is applied you should be able to simply test that what you put in gives you the answer that you expect to get at the end. Sometimes AusAID sees that sophistication equals complexity. They don’t see that sophisticated can be simple.

Clarity. A lot of the stuff in education is shrouded in mysterious language. A lack of ambiguity is essential so I know what is actually telling me so I can understand it.

A general comment on language: some monitoring and evaluation people don’t think about communication, they forget keep it simple stupid. People are often reluctant to ask questions when they don’t understand. It is important that terminology is kept simple.

Things that would turn me off a framework would be: complexity. It needs to be something there are regular AusAID’s person can use, we are not evaluation specialists, I would ask is it very technical? Can a general development person pick it up and use it. This would be pretty crucial.
It must also be understood by those working on the ground.

Source Material:

It needs to be easily understood by teams and partners.

Source Material:

For me, what is hard is when I’m expected to know as much as the monitoring and evaluation adviser so that I can make judgements about what is coming out of the monitoring and evaluation—that is why we have a monitoring and evaluation adviser.

Source Material:

If it couldn’t be used by the people receiving the capacity development, if they are not comfortable using it because it is filled with jargon, in language that they are not comfortable with, asking for things clearly developed by somebody who is sitting at a desk in the capital that are not appropriate.

Small.

Source Material:

It needs to be small in terms of conceptual complexity and absolute size.

Language (translation).

Source Material:

How easy it is to translate into another language. We can not always assume that everyone will be fluent in English.

Source Material:

The first is that people can understand it: is it communicated in a way that concepts can be transferred across language and cultural conceptions.

That it is not too complex for people to be able to keep the whole framework in their head. I am only interested in frameworks that people can remember and not have to go back to a textbook. If it is overly complex, I am not interested. It needs to be small in terms of conceptual complexity and absolute size.

Intuitive. It must be intuitive. When people look at it, they must go, yes that’s right, it fits with their picture of the world.
APPENDIX F. DOCUMENTS REVIEWED FOR CASE STUDIES

AIPEG


AIPD


Application of the CDE Framework to the Evaluation of Capacity Development Initiatives

SIGHMP


## APPENDIX G. CROSS-CASE ANALYSIS TABLES

Cross case table for characteristics of a useful framework for evaluating capacity development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>SIGHMP</th>
<th>AIPD</th>
<th>AIPEG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easy to understand</td>
<td>Simplicity of language, concepts and presentation.</td>
<td>Considered to be virtually self-explanatory largely due to presentation. Vertical element of the Framework easy to understand.</td>
<td>Language, concepts and presentation found to be simple. Through the definition of output and outcome and the diagram. The term 'enabling environment' led to confusion with climate change.</td>
<td>Language, concepts and presentation found to be simple. Simplicity was due to definitions of output and immediate outcome, and presentation. The four elements of capacity presented greatest challenge to understanding, in particular organisation and enabling environment as elements of capacity development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to use</td>
<td>Practical rather than theoretical in implementation. Integrated into activity implementation rather than a separate function. Does not require M&amp;E expertise to implement.</td>
<td>Easy to apply for those with limited or no M&amp;E experience. Not dependent on the availability of M&amp;E expertise. Not integrated into activities due to timing of introduction.</td>
<td>All users found the CDE Framework easy to implement. The key elements were output and outcome definitions, and the key evaluation questions. The M&amp;E system and activity implementation were fully integrated. Application at the start of the initiative supported its integration into design and implementation. There is insufficient evidence to identify the extent to which M&amp;E expertise is required.</td>
<td>Easy to apply, application became easier as experience developed. Used effectively despite limited availability of M&amp;E expertise. Integrated into activities as a consequence of the design of activities being based on the CDE Framework. However, attitudinal barriers among some Lead Advisers limited integration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Application of the CDE Framework to the Evaluation of Capacity Development Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>SIGHMP</th>
<th>AIPD</th>
<th>AIPEG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Realistic Resource Requirements</td>
<td>Requirements for human, time and financial resources are not significant and the benefits outweigh the resource costs. Ideally, limited requirement for data.</td>
<td>In a context where there was no budget for internal monitoring provided by the client, resource requirements were minimal and realistic. The benefits were seen to outweigh the costs. Data requirements were realistic.</td>
<td>Realistic (or even reduced) resource requirements through integration into activity management and clarifying data requirements and which activities should/should not be evaluated.</td>
<td>Resource levels were not unreasonably high. An individual’s attitude to M&amp;E affected their opinion on whether the resource requirements were realistic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigour</td>
<td>Supports implementation of rigorous, but not excessive, evaluations with honest findings. While quantitative analysis was often desired, this was not a consistent element of this criterion.</td>
<td>Supported honest findings as CDE Framework made hiding problems difficult due to clearly defining each element of capacity for each output and outcome level.</td>
<td>Supported rigorous, honest evaluation findings.</td>
<td>Supported rigorous evaluations through the specification of clearly defined, measurable outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Versatility</td>
<td>Applicable at different levels of a system; in different sectors and cultures; for different sized agencies; for initiatives of different size, implementation strategy and stage in project lifecycle; enable a variety of M&amp;E methodologies.</td>
<td>All those who used the CDE Framework concluded it was suitable for SIGHMP. Several have since applied the Framework on other initiatives and in different countries.</td>
<td>Applicable to all capacity development initiatives on AIPD and able to respond to changes in context, approach and priorities. Has been applied by AIPD team members to other initiatives in Indonesia and Philippines. Not appropriate for monitoring achievement of inputs, activities or payment milestones.</td>
<td>Was applicable to all activities supporting economic governance capacity development in various agencies. Was applicable for M&amp;E of activity and Sub-facility. Has been applied by users to projects undertaken at a University in Indonesia. Other users intend to apply it elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristic</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>SIGHMP</td>
<td>AIPD</td>
<td>AIPEG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use and usability</td>
<td>Findings support use and are provided in a timely manner. Findings can be used to support the partner agency in planning and decision-making; the donor in program planning and implementation of other activities; and communication with stakeholders; and also meet the information needs of the program.</td>
<td>Supported decision making at operational levels. This is possibly through the focus of questions on application of outputs and why outcomes have not been achieved, the Framework’s simplicity supporting frequent application and its explicit nature. There is no evidence that it supported decision-making at strategic levels.</td>
<td>Particularly at a strategic level. This appears to be through the provision of findings that inform decision-making. Supported communication of initiative and M&amp;E with stakeholders through clarity. There is no evidence of supporting partners planning or decision making.</td>
<td>CDE Framework supported usability of M&amp;E. Actual use of findings was dependent on the manager’s attitude to M&amp;E and the findings rather than the CDE Framework. There is limited anecdotal evidence of supporting partners planning or decision-making.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Cross-case table of information users want evaluations of capacity development to provide.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>SIGHMP</th>
<th>AIPD</th>
<th>AIPEG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What has changed?</strong></td>
<td>Demonstration of planned change in individual’s knowledge, skills and behaviour and the organisation. To a lesser extent, contribution and unintended change.</td>
<td>Change was identified through the clear specification of what was to be achieved (the same as picture of success) and horizontal progression to outcomes. The previous approach had not identified change. Contribution of SIGHMP to change was clear. Data was not collected on identification of unintended outcomes.</td>
<td>Change at output level identified. Limited organisational change and change in service delivery identified because it was too early to see significant change at these levels. Change demonstrated through the horizontal component of the Framework. Too early to identify contribution, but results chain and the causality question are believed to enable this. No evidence whether unintended change is identified.</td>
<td>Change at output and outcome level identified. Change was identified through the results chain and picture of success. The contribution of AIPEG to the change was demonstrated through the results chain. There is no evidence that the CDE Framework contributed to identification of unintended change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What progress has been made toward sustainable achievement of the objective?</strong></td>
<td>Has the original objective been achieved and if not, what progress has been made toward its achievement? Can the improvements in organisational performance be continued? Can the improvements in organisational performance be sustained?</td>
<td>Progress and lack of progress were identified through the results chain. CDE Framework identified previously unidentified areas of lack of progress. The cause of lack of progress was identified through the causality question. Enabled identification of partial achievement of the objective and strategies to support full achievement of the objective. This is through the focus on the four elements of capacity.</td>
<td>Enabled early identification that the objective was unlikely to be achieved and subsequently that it would not be achieved. This would not have been possible with the previous M&amp;E approach. Both progress and lack of progress were identified. The CDE Framework encouraged a focus on sustainability. Progress identified through the timeline, results chain and comparing indicators with the</td>
<td>Both progress and lack of progress were identified, this had not occurred before the CDE Framework was introduced. Progress was identified through the horizontal results chain. There is limited evidence that the CDE Framework supports answering the question of achievement of objective. Provided information on sustainability of outcomes through the definition of outcomes at</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>SIGHMP</th>
<th>AIPD</th>
<th>AIPEG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CDE Framework provided information on sustainability of outcomes.</td>
<td>baseline. Information on sustainability was provided through the clear specification of outputs and outcomes at an organisational level.</td>
<td>different levels with a picture of success, and perhaps the risk component. CDE Framework encouraged some users to consider sustainability who may otherwise not.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the capacity development strategy work?</td>
<td>Identified whether capacity development strategies were or were not working. This was possibly through the results chain.</td>
<td>Differences in effectiveness of capacity development strategies were identified.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The impact environmental factors had on progress and achievement of outcomes. Changes in the context that could influence the future direction.</td>
<td>The Framework identified environmental factors impacting outcomes.</td>
<td>The Framework identified whether specific capacity development strategies were effective. This was through results chain, picture of success and the causality question.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessons that can be applied to improve this and future initiatives.</td>
<td>Through the CDE Framework, the team identified lessons learned for application to SIGHMP and AusAID identified lessons for application to the future initiatives. The lessons learned were dependent on the users’ perception of their responsibility.</td>
<td>Lessons learned have been identified. This through the risk element.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX H. REFERENCE TO DATA

1 DS 10703
2 Di 3409
3 CLG1 3765
4 CL 536
5 D1, 4112; D2, 13307; D3, 12178
6 D2 13307
7 D12, 8931; DIE, 9818; DIG, 10727; DRS, 6673 & 8954; DI1, 7944; DIE1, 12208 & 18615
8 DIE1, 17277.
9 DIE1, 18615
10 D12, 9076; DE, 13518; DN, 8645
11 DE, 13518
12 EG 13501
13 EL, 4787
14 EL, 6869; EN, 8890
15 ALS 4923; TASX2 4052
16 TAS, 4059
17 ME 5940 & 8385; MP 9938; MPT 5344; PG2 15168
18 ME 5940
19 ME 6537
20 MPA 12759
21 Z2, 2332
22 Z2, 1430; Z3, 8999
23 D2, 14203.
24 D1 4239; DS 10324; P11377
25 P 1347
26 D3 15895; DE 14784; DI1 7769; DI3 8300; DI4 9065; DR1 9649; DR3 11197; D5 12403; EN 8026; Z3 9361
27 D3 8300
28 DN 8645
29 DE, 14784
30 DE, 7769
31 D3 15895; DI4 9065; DR3 11197; D5 12403
32 D1 3599; DE 14784; DI1 8088; DIE 10578; DIE1 12208; DR1 9772
33 DI2 6029; DIG 10983
34 DIG 10983
35 MPA 11169; TA1 2345; AX2 15979
36 MPA 11169
37 TA1, 2495
38 E2 16334, 17295 & 17390; EN 8026; DIE 10639; DE 14784; E 7067
39 E2 17390
40 CLK 2407
41 AG, 5451
42 MPT, 7065
43 EG 13316
44 DI, 9913; DI3, 11632; D14, 9065; DI, 4811; Z3, 9225.
45 Z3 9225
46 D1, 4811
47 D12 7418
48 CLG1 4613
49 CLG1 4000; CLG2 1237; CLK 1745; CLS 5622; CLSX2 3299
50 CL, 715
51 CLK 1745
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cvi AX2 17465; CLG2 3257; MPT 6815
cvii DS 125666
cviii Z317642, DS 12566
cix D2 12610, D13 11789
cx TA1 3582
cxi ME 7923, EN 10185
cxii DDI2 18050
cxiii DE 17215
cxiv DR3 1704, E 8070, EG 13829, M 6446, MPT 6815, MPTG 11356
cxv AX2 16208, Z2 8070
cxvi MPTG 6815
cxvii DE 16732, DIE 12723, DN 11104, EG 14057
cxviii EG 14057
cxix DIE 12723
cxx DI2 10906
cxxi DI2 10906, DS 12165
cxxii DN 10312, D2 12702, P10170
cxxiii DN 10312
cxxiv TA1 3343, AX2 15751
cxxv DN 11384
cxxvi EL 8142
cxxvii PG1 9007
cxxviii D3 1274, DIE 12380, DIE2 2346, Z1 9066
cxxix D3 1274
cxxx D3 14255, DIE 12380
cxxxi Z1 9066
cxxii DIE 12380
cxxiii PG2 16093; CLS2 12552
cxxiv PG2 16093
cxxv DR3 12004, DRS 4164
cxxvi CLG2 2409
cxxvii TS 5838
cxxviii TS 4613
cxxix TS 4613
cxx 3TS 1652
cxxi 3TS 10773
cxxii 2TS 241 & 2043
cxxiii TASX2 13625
cxxiv 3TS 31
cxxv 3TS 6574
cxxvi DRS 7514
cxxvii CLS 6006
cxxviii 2TS 2194
cxxix 3TS 1805 & 6886
cx CLS2 9749; ES 1104
cxi CLS2 9749
cxii DRS 2613
cxiii 2TS 2804
cxiv 3TS 2189
cxv P8 57
cxvi 2TS 2804
cxvii DRS 7781
cxviii Email 5A8z TS 8428
cxix Email 5A8z TS 8286
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cls TAS 3584
clexi TAS 3584
clexii CLS 5614
clexiii P5 556 & 2653; TS 4774; 3TS 6134
clexiv TAS 1270
clexv CLS2 10327
clexvi DRS 3057
clexvii TAS 1270
clexviii TAS 840
clexix DRS 2613
clexx CLS 6962; DRS 1314, 2613 & 4953
clexxi CLS2 7947
clexxii DRS 7199
clexxiii TS 5838
clexxiv DRS 2613
clexxv DRS 1314 & 6675
clexxvi DRS 1314; TS 4173
clexxvii SIHMP 16385
clexxviii DRS 7384; 3TS 6459
clexxix TS 4173
clexxx ALS 2197
clexxi 2TS 663
clexxii 2TS 2804
clexxiii S 1325
clexxiv 3TS 5836
clexxv 3TS 5838
clexxvi 2TS 3966
clexxvii TASX2 13982
clexxviii TAS 2064
clexxix P4 548, 551 & 254
cxx P11 16385
cxxi P10, 118109
cxxii CLS2, 9463
cxxiii TAS 582
cxxiv 3TS 8754
cxxv P5 889
cxxvi TAS 582
cxxvii TAS 2064
cxxviii 3TS 5168
cxxix CLS2 8446
cxxx CLS2 8446
cxx CLS2 8446
cx P11 16836
cxi 3TS 5168
cxii 3TS 7493
cxiii 3TS 5168
cxiv ALS 2853
cxv DRS 3057
cxvi CLS 3438
cxvii CLS2 8446
cxviii 2MK 14755
cxix DIPK2, 4933
cxx 2EL, 21865
cxxi ALK, 3105; ALK2, 1069 & 6781; CLK, 4549; 2EL, 14438; MK, 6379; ALK6 10337; PK 9447
cxxii E, 7184
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cclxxii 2DIPK3 3021
cclxxiii 3ELK 251
cclxx 2DIPK3, 8035
cclxxi 2DIPK2, 9660
cclxx 2DIPK2 5781
cclxx 2DIPK2 9660
cclxx 2EL, 15748
cclxxiv 2MK, 15545
cclxxv 2DIPK2 8812
cclxxvi MK 15545
cclxxvii 2DIPK2, 13626
cclxxviii 2EL, 8905; ALK, 2108; ALK2, 7668; CLK, 2699; DIPK, 4593; DIPK 2, 12145; DIPK 3, 7730; MK, 7145
cclxxx 2E, 255
cclxxxi ALK6, 14252; ALK5 6064
cclxxxii ALK6, 14252
cclxxxiii 2EL, 83 & 19282; ALK, 1760; ALK2, 8169; CLK, 7866; DILK, 6109 & 5805; DIPK, 7833; DIPK2, 6925 & 7258; DIPK3, 5661
cclxxxiv ALK4 3396 & 3480; ALK6 647, 18697 & 19036; DIPK2 15439; DIPK3 5736 & 6499; MK 5713 & 9626
cclxxxv DIPK2 6499; MK 9626; AIPD P25 page 4
cclxxxvi DIPK3 6499; MK 9626; AIPD P25 page 6-7 and 19
cclxxxvii P25 p4
cclxxxviii DILK 6109
cclxxxv DILK 6109
cclxxxvi ALK8 8169
cclxxxvii ALK2; DIPK2, 6925; DIPK3, 3583; DILK, 8033
cclxxxviii DIPK 3583 & 7351; DILK 8033
cclxxxix 2DIPK2, 15439
cclxxx ARK3, 6499; PK 8601
cclxxxii ALK5 1850; DIPK2 6925
cclxxxiii ALK5 1850
cclxxxiv DIPK3 6499
cclxxxv ALK2 7081
cclxxxvi ALK2, 8787
cclxxxvii ALK4, 976; ALK5, 5955; ALK6, 18697; 2DIPK2 8811, 9660 & 16146; 3ELK, 1805, 2456; 2MK 6031 & 7737; PK 6683 & 6962
cclxxxviii ALK6 18697
cclxxxv ALK6 18697
cclxxxxi 2DIPK2 8811 & 9660; 3ELK 1805 & 2456
cclxxxvii 2DIPK2 9660
cclxxxviii DILK, 7457; DIPK 2, 8455
cclxxxix 2DIPK2 9660; DIPK, 9103
cclxxxx 2EL, 21353; ALK, 3531; CLK, 9708; DILK, 8769; DIPK, 101 29; DIPK 2, 9494; DIPK 3, 6438; PK 8194
cclxxxxi 2MK 9275
cclxxxxii 2EL, 20688 & 21032; ALK2, 10361; DILK, 7457; DIPK, 9008; DIPK 2, 8455
cclxxxxiii DILK, 7457
cclxxxxiv DIPK 10129
cclxxxxv CLK 9708
cclxxxxvi DIPK, 8164; DIPK2, 9944
cclxxxxvii DIPK2, 16003
cclxxxxviii ALK6 4100 & 4786; DIPK2 16003; PK 7705
cclxxxxix 2DIPK3 6150
cclxxxxx 2EL, 19640
cclxxxxvi ALK2, 9311
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application of the CDE Framework to the Evaluation of Capacity Development Initiatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2DIG3 2750; 2MPTGX2 7622; 3MPTG 6327, 15477, 16155 &amp; 16897; 3PG2 10629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG, 4542; 2AG2, 6450; TAG, 2541 &amp; 4380; AG3 7925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2DIG3 2142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2AG2 11018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG2 2219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG2 3026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2AG2 6450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2AG2 11018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAG, 5024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4 62359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLG3, 6763; DIG, 5467; DIG2X2, 4125 &amp; 9138; TAG, 11366; 3ELG 16004; DIG4 4336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPTG, 1346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4 60933; P6 3407; P2 67623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2 67623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2DIG2X2 9138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG, 3209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3ELG 17598; MPTG 1346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG3 8840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLG3 6736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIG4 4336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIS inspection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3ELG 21290; LG, 4462; TAG, 4462 &amp; 7215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3ELG 21619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG, 4462; TAG, 7215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAG, 7215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG3 13040; TAG 7215; 2AG 7361; 3PG2 2729; MPTG 29342; 2DIG2 7294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2DIG3 1280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELG2 4221 &amp; 5887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG 2984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAG, 3183; EG3, 8745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PG2 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2AG2 11018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2AG2, 8202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2AG2, 8202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAG, 7459 &amp; 3183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3ELG 15099; 3PG2 945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2MPTGX2, 3090 &amp; 3274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIG2X2, 4125, 4470 &amp; 5153; 2DIG2 75; 2DIG3 5007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2DIG3 5959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIG2X2, 6541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2DIG3 5007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG3, 12039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELG 2962 &amp; 3183; DIG 5609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2MPTGX2, 8164; 2AG2, 7898; EG3, 6146; TAG, 9644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG3 6789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG3 8840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3MPTG 7231</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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cdlxxiv AG3 9392
cdlxxv DIG4 2900
cdlxxvi 2AG, 5075; ELG, 4337; 2MPTGX2, 4650; LG, 5306
cdlxxvii 2AG2, 10038; AG3 10757; ELG 12730; ELG2 8740; EG3, 8754; 2MPTGX2 4650; 3MPTG 11786;
TAG, 3183 & 11062
cdlxxviii EG3 8754
cdlxxix AIPEG P3 724
cdlxxx AG2 10038

cdlxxxi P3 724

cdlxxxiEG3, 8754; 2MPTGX2 4650

cdlxxii AG2 8202
cdlxxiii AG2 4690

cdlxxiv 3MPTG 11786
cdlxxv ELG 4337

cdlxxvi AG3 10757

cdlxxvii ALK, 3105; ALK2, 1069 & 6781; CLK, 4549; 2EL, 14438; MK, 6379; ALK6 10337; PK 9447;
ELG2 582; LG 2179

cdlxxviii E, 7184

cdlxxix AG3 1217

cdxc 3MPTG 24965

cdxcii ALK5 4839

cdxciii ALK6 1033

cdxciv 2EL, 10395

cdxcv 2DIPK2, 13626

cdxcvi ELG2 582; LG 2179

cdxcvii EL, 7224, 2EL, 11237; ALK2, 1069; CLK, 4549; DILK, 2492; ELK 11237

cdxcviii ALK4 1372, 1847; ALK5 1724, 2592; PK 4253

cdxcix ALK4 1847

d ALK5 2592
di TAS, 1730
dii PK 8986
diii CLK, 4549
div ELG2 582; LG 2179; 2EL, 11237; ALK2, 6020, DIPK, 10129
dv P11 9494 & 16174

dvi ALK4 1372, 1847; ALK5 1724; ALK6 10992; ELK 2456; PK 4253

dvii PK 5498
dviii 2AG, 2259 & 2784; LG, 7303
dix 2EL, 11237
dxi DIG, 9132
dxii ALK2, 946 & 1069; ALK3, 918; ALK6, 11729; DIPK, 3374 & 4593; DIPK2 3830 & 11895; TAS 1001

dxiii ALK2, 946

dxiv ALK4 1372, 1847; ALK5 1724; ALK6 10992; ELK 2456; PK 4253

dxv 2AG 980; AG3 3669; CLG2 1978; EG3 3940, 4777 & 12039; ELG2 2184 & 4748; 3PG2 2819; TAG
3951; EL, 6254; ALK2, 946

dxvi 3PG2 2819

dxvii 2EL, 15855

dxviii EG3 3940

dxcii 2EL, 23118

dxciii P5 1462; P6 4783

dxc DIG2X2 4604
dxct DIG2X2 4470

dxct ALK5 2592, 3255; 3ELK 2456

dxcti ALK5 3255

dxctii MPTG 8758
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