|  |
| --- |
| **Activity Monitoring, Evaluation, Research & Learning (MERL) Framework: Key Standards and Guidelines** |

**Owner:** Insights, Monitoring & Evaluation Unit, Pacific Development Group

**Last updated:** 6 September 2019

**Purpose of this document**

This document provides basic standards and guidance for developing an Activity Monitoring, Evaluation, Research and Learning (MERL) Framework. It is based on feedback from staff and implementing partners, and informed by international good practices shared by other development agencies[[1]](#footnote-1). This guidance will **continue to be improved over time** with further feedback from staff and enhanced with good practice examples.

**MERL Advisers** from PDG’s Development Capability and Insights (DCI) provide group training as well as advice and feedback for fit for purpose MERL tailored to the Activity’s size, needs and complexity.

**Contents**

[**1.** **OVERVIEW** 2](#_Toc18667422)

[**2.** **ACTIVITY LOGIC DIAGRAM** 5](#_Toc18667423)

[**3.** **ACTIVITY MERL TABLE** 7](#_Toc18667424)

[**4.** **ACTIVITY MERL WORKPLAN** 11](#_Toc18667425)

[Appendix One: Template for MERL Table with key definitions 13](#_Toc18667426)

[Appendix Two: Template for MERL Table (with examples in blue) 14](#_Toc18667427)

[Appendix Three: Template for Activity MERL Workplan 16](#_Toc18667428)

# **OVERVIEW**

**Why do we need a MERL framework for the Activity?**

MERL frameworks are an important management tool for Activity Managers. The framework guides the collection and use of meaningful and timely information for:

1. assessing **how well the Activity is performing**
2. providing **evidence** and **learnings** for **decision-making** and **adaptive management** (inflight adjustments) to maximise relevance, efficiency and effectiveness. The importance of evidence for decision-making and tracking results is highlighted in *NZ’s Sustainable Development Cooperation Policy* and
3. assessing **key contextual** (e.g. socio-economic and political) factors that impact on MFAT’s engagement.

**What is the difference between MERL and reporting?**

MERL is not just about reporting to donors. MERL is primarily a tool for implementing partners to gather evidence needed to help manage, learn and make decisions about the Activity. This is particularly important to help navigate the Activity through risks, issues and uncertainties.

A sub-set of the MERL information collected by implementing partners is used for accountability reporting to MFAT. MFAT uses the information in these reports to govern the Activity and inform 4 Year Plan (4YP) management and corporate reporting.

The relationship between MERL and accountability reporting is illustrated in Figure 1.

**Figure 1.**

**Purpose of Activity MERL framework**

**Evidence for implementing partner** to manage, learn and make decisions about the Activity

Evidence for accountability reporting to MFAT

for Activity management

For 4YP management

**What does an Activity MERL framework contain?**

The Activity MERL Framework is aligned with the higher level MERL framework for the 4 Year Plan and consists of three inter-related components:

* A **diagram** **of the theory of change** that visually depicts the outcomes the Activity is seeking to achieve and how they link to 4YP outcomes. It is also a communications tool for engagement with stakeholders.
* Accompanied by a **1 page narrative** summarising the problem analysis, key assumptions and risks underpinning the logic.
* **Schedule** of key monitoring, evaluation, and research tasks to collect the evidence
* Identifies how the evidence will be used to support Activity **management, learning and adaptation**
* Key **results indicators**, baseline and targets for tracking progress of outcomes in the Logic Diagram, and
* **Other evidence** (including from research and evaluation) to address knowledge gaps, test critical assumptions, assess Activity value, impact

**A note about MERL for adaptive management**

This guideline identifies **minimum standards** that should apply to all project-type Activities, **as well as additional guidance to support adaptive management** of innovative, complex and higher risk Activities in dynamic contexts. This recognises we often work in contexts with changing risks and opportunities.

***Adaptive Management***is defined as a structured process that allows for taking action under uncertain conditions based on the best available information, closely monitoring and evaluating outcomes, re-assessing and adjusting decisions as more information is learned.



# **ACTIVITY LOGIC DIAGRAM**

An Activity logic diagram shows the theory of change underpinning the Activity. It shows the linkages between the high level outcomes identified in the 4YP, and specific outcomes sought by the Activity. It also depicts the level of changes the Activity can realistically seek to influence in recognition of external actors or contextual factors that impact outcomes.

Example format for an Activity Logic Diagram (implementing partners can opt for other formats)



The logic diagram should be developed:

* using **evidence-based problem analysis**[[2]](#footnote-2) completed for the 4YP development. This includes reviewing any existing evaluation, research[[3]](#footnote-3), and monitoring assessments relating to the topic.
* reflecting consideration of **key development quality criteria** i.e. inclusive, sustained, resilient and effective development[[4]](#footnote-4),
* in consultation with **key stakeholders so it reflects shared understanding** of the problem and the underpinning causal relationships. A workshop is often a good way to discuss and clarify assumptions underpinning the theory of change. The level of stakeholder engagement needs to be fit-for-purpose, and match the social, political, financial and operational complexity of the Activity.

The initial high level theory of change diagram is developed during the Strategic Case in the Business Case to help translate the problem analysis into a set of desired outcomes we propose to invest in. This high level diagram will not include outputs as it is developed before the options have been assessed.

This is further explained in [Guidance note on logic diagram](http://o-wln-gdm/Activities/PoliciesandProcedures/InternationalDevelopment/Continuous%20Improvement%20Programme/2C%20-%20Infosheet%20-%20Intervention%20logic%20diagrams%20for%20Activity%20goal.pdf)s. Once the preferred option has been selected, **a full logic diagram** is developed as part of the Activity design to show how the Activity is expected to achieve the desired outcomes and contribute to 4YP outcomes. This includes:

* setting out how the Outputs (i.e. products/services funded by the Activity) are expected to lead to Short Term Outcomes, which then contribute to Medium and Long Term Outcomes.
* assessing key assumptions and risks in the Risk Management Table and reflecting these (and mitigation measures) if appropriate in the Logic Diagram (for e.g., completing a detailed needs assessment with in-country key stakeholders as an initial output to address risks around limited understanding of country-specific issues and lack of stakeholder buy-in).
* an accompanyingone-page narrative describing the intervention logic or theory of change i.e. how addressing the identified short and medium term outcomes will contribute to the long term outcomes which addresses the problem. It should also identify the key assumptions that underpin this intervention logic.

**For Activities operating in dynamic contexts** with uncertainties, changing risks and opportunities, the problem analysis and linkages to outcomes are often less clear or are evolving. The logic diagram represents a ‘best estimation’ and it is important to:

1. Identify **knowledge gaps** and **test the most critical assumptions** through further research, needs assessment and stakeholder consultation
2. Consider what other evidence may be required to support **adaptive management** or **problem-driven iterative adaptation**.
3. **Regularly review and update the logic diagram** to ensure the causal relationships, risks and assumptions are valid. The outcomes will be reviewed annually by implementing partners and MFAT. They can be updated earlier if they are affected by significant changes in the social, economic, environmental or political context. Reasons for changes must be clearly documented and any changes to the Activity must be approved by the MFAT Unit Manager.

# **ACTIVITY MERL TABLE**

The purpose of the MERL table is to identify what evidence is required to inform Activity management, learning, decision-making, iterative adaptation and accountability reporting. This information will also provide evidence to enable assessment or evaluation of the Activity’s relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability.

This table is drafted as part of Activity design, and then reviewed and agreed with the implementing partner and stakeholders during the inception phase.

Before developing a MERL Table, it is helpful to first consider key evaluative questions.

**Key evaluative questions**

Key evaluation questions help us identify and prioritise what evidence should be gathered (some examples are included in the following table).

|  |
| --- |
| 1. How are contextual factors and any changes (e.g. social, economic, political environment, other donors, partners) impacting the Activity? 2. How good and relevant are the outputs being delivered? Who is the Activity reaching? What is working for whom in which situations? What is not working? 3. To what extent are Activity outcomes delivering quality development identified in New Zealand’s Sustainable Development Policy: Inclusive, Sustained, Resilient & Effective Development? 4. How effectively is the Activity being managed by the Implementing Partner and MFAT? 5. Is the Activity making progress towards the intended short, medium and long term outcomes? Why? Why not? Are there unintended consequences? 6. Are the benefits commensurate with the investment of funding and effort? To what extent is the Activity cost effective? Is the Activity worth the cost? 7. What are the key learnings on what is working? What is not working and why? What are the opportunities for improvement? |

The MERL Table sets out qualitative and quantitative evidence needed to monitor and evaluate progress against the Activity’s outputs and outcomes:

* **Key indicators**, baseline and targets for tracking outcomes in the Logic Diagram
* **Other evidence** to fill knowledge gaps; test critical assumptions; to assess the value and impact of the 4 Year Plan (including evidence generated by research & evaluation)

**Key indicators**

Indicators are variables or measures that help assess progress or achievement of outcomes and outputs.

The MERL table includes key indicators, baselines, targets for assessing outputs and outcomes. Short term outcomes tend to be specific to the Activity. Indicators for medium and long term outcomes should align with those from the 4YP MERL framework. Key definitions, examples and a template are available in Appendix 1 and 2 of this document.

MERL Tables contain **standard indicators** for organisational reporting as well as **Activity-specific indicators** to inform Activity management.

1. **Standard indicators for reporting**

There are mandatory and supplementary (optional) standard indicators in MFAT’s PDG [**Strategic Results Framework**](http://o-wln-gdm/Activities/PoliciesandProcedures/InternationalDevelopment/Continuous%20Improvement%20Programme/STRATEGIC%20RESULTS%20FRAMEWORK%20A3%202018-20.docx) **(SRF).**

* 1. **Mandatory indicators** consist of Global and Direct Result indicators used for aggregate organisational reporting including MFAT’s annual report to Parliament. Activity MERL Tables need to include all relevant mandatory indicators:
     1. **Global Results Indicators** are standard indicators that monitor context as well as long term outcomes that MFAT contributes to alongside many other partners. Data for these indicators come from existing sources collated by DCI or Sector Leads.
     2. **Direct Results Indicators** are more attributable to MFAT’s Activities. Data from these indicators come from Activity Reporting. The indicator wording can be refined as necessary so it is more relevant to the Activity (e.g. ‘No. of health workers’ trained can be refined if needed to something more specific like ‘No. of community nurses trained in management of diabetes’.)
  2. **Supplementary indicators** that are standard, sector/thematic specific indicators recommended by MFAT Sector Leads. Data for long term outcomes and most medium term outcomes come from existing data sources collated by Sector Leads.

1. **Activity-specific indicators** 
   1. Indicators from Partner government’s National development plan results frameworks: Where relevant and possible, Activity MERL Tables should use or align with indicators already used by partner governments, particularly for long and medium term outcomes.
   2. Customised indicators: these are bespoke indicators developed specifically to inform management and decision-making.

|  |
| --- |
| **Key tips for developing customised indicators:**  Indicators can be quantitative or qualitative:   * Examples of **quantitative** indicators include measures of amounts, proportions, length, income, time, cost. * Examples of **qualitative** indicators include assessment of perceptions, opinions, quality of life, strength, capacity.   Good indicators meet the following **criteria**:  - **Valid**: actually measure the result, not something else.  - **Reliable**: consistently measure the result over time.  - **Sensitive**: able to pick up on changes in the result, including the size and rate of change.  - **Simple**: relatively easy to collect and analyse.  - **Affordable**: data collection cost not a disproportionate drain on resources.  Most people-related indicators should report **gender and age disaggregated data** where feasible. Where **cross cutting issues** (gender equality and women’s empowerment, human rights, environment and climate change) are intended to be Principal or Significant outcomes of the Activity, the MERL Table needs to include indicators and/or other evidence that assess these outcomes. |

**Other evidence**

Indicators tell us mainly basic information like ‘what’, ‘where’ and ‘how many’. For insights into questions like ‘why’, ‘how’ and ‘so what’, teams will need to draw on other evidence from **research, monitoring and evaluation**. This includes understanding **key contextual factors** (e.g. social, economic, political) and how they impact on MFAT’s engagement, as well as other **knowledge gaps** and **key assumptions** that need to be tested

More **innovative, higher risk or complex Activities in dynamic contexts** require deeper and broader insights to inform **learning and adaptive management.** For such Activities, it is useful to supplement results indicators with other evidence such as:

1. **Stakeholder feedback loops** including perspectives from beneficiaries, partners and those excluded
2. A few useful indicators or evaluative questions to **monitor key risks and contextual factors** that are likely to influence outcomes
3. Some **lead indicators** which provide early prediction of progress towards outcomes and useful to inform any needed course-correction/adaptive management.
4. A few specific **research or evaluative questions** to address knowledge gaps, test critical assumptions, assess Activity value, impact, and unintended outcomes
5. Indicators of how well **learning** is occurring **and adaptation used** to continuously improve the Activity’s relevance and effectiveness.

The following table provides a **simplified example** of how results indicators and other evidence can be applied (this example is further elaborated in Appendix 2):

**Activity: Training farmers in Community X to increase coffee production**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outputs** | **Indicators/other evidence** | **Type** | **Use for management & improvement** | **Use for reporting** |
| Training needs assessment and plan completed | Training needs assessment conducted and **action plan** completed in consultation with key stakeholders | Qualitative Results indicator | ✓ | ✓ |
| Farmers received training in improved coffee growing practices | Number of participants who **completed** training on … (total, M/F) | Quantitative Results indicator | ✓ | ✓ |
| % of participants **satisfied** with relevance and quality of training (total number, % M/F) | Quantitative Results indicator | ✓ | ✓ |
| What do participants **value about the training** and what needs **improvement**? | Other evidence: Evaluative question | ✓ | Could summarise key learning and any adaptation in progress report |
| Are there any **unintended consequences** from the training? | Other evidence: Evaluative question | ✓ |


**HELP is available!**

A **template** for the MERL Table is provided in Appendix A.

Examples are included in Appendix B.

**DCI’s MERL Advisers** are available to support teams in identifying appropriate indicators and other evidence to support their 4YP.

# **ACTIVITY MERL WORKPLAN**

****The purpose of this work plan is to ensure the **collection and use** of information identified in the MERL Table have been **adequately planned for,** and **resourced** with **responsibilities** assigned. **DCI’s MERL Advisers** are available to advise on the development of **fit for purpose** MERL work-plans tailored to the Activity’s size, needs and complexity.

This work plan should be included in the **Activity Business Case (under Management Case)**. **A template is available in Appendix 3**. Key elements to be considered in this plan include the following:

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Are **baseline data** available for each result in the MERL Table? If not, processes and tools to collect baseline need to be developed/improved, and included in the workplan and budget |
| 1. **Monitoring, review, learning (& adaptation), and reporting tasks such as:**     1. Regular collection ofquantitative and qualitative data in the MERL Table    2. For higher value or risk Activities in dynamic contexts:       1. The monitoring system needs to regularly provide important contextual information or analyses in a timely manner to assess if planned outputs and short term outcomes remain relevant, or need to be adjusted in response to changes in context/need. The in-country Implementing Partner, MFAT Activity Manager and in-country MFAT Post all have an important role in context monitoring.       2. Include smaller, iterative evaluative approaches to test key assumptions and provide faster feedback loops for ‘build, test/measure, learn and adapt’ approaches to Activity design and management. Align frequency of monitoring with the pace of change.      * + 1. The Logic Diagram needs to be reviewed frequently and updated as needed (using evidence from MERL). The changes and rationale are documented, highlighting any budgetary or programmatic implications.   1. Analysis of ‘Why, So What and Now What’: Internal results and learning discussions informed by evidence on progress, issues/challenges and lessons to inform planning and decision-making   2. The reflection and learning informs review and any adjustments to the Logic Diagram, MERL Table, and Activity workplan to ensure they remain relevant and useful   3. **Monitoring visits** conducted or commissioned by MFAT to reality check progress of an Activity or investigate emerging issues in more detail.   4. **Progress reports submitted by Implementing Partners to MFAT** (particularly important for Activities requiring more adaptive management)   5. **Formal meetings with MFAT** to review Activity progress, discuss and agree on any adjustments to Activity design and/or implementation approach, Results Framework, and Activity workplan. |
| 1. **Evaluations:** Depending on the purpose and need (decision-making, learning and accountability), the following types of evaluation[[5]](#footnote-5) should be considered in the workplan and budget:    1. **formative evaluations** early in inception or implementation period to help fine-tune Activity design. It can also be conducted part way through implementation to take stock of progress and lessons learned to inform decisions about the remaining period of the Activity (could be an independent evaluation commissioned by MFAT, or led jointly by the Partner and MFAT),    2. **developmental evaluation** can support the design of an innovative Activity, radically redesign an existing Activity, or design a crisis response in a dynamic, complex or uncertain environment.   C:\Users\MHarley\Pictures\tip.jpg **TIP:** In determining **what** type of evaluation is appropriate and **when** to do an evaluation, it is critical to consider:   1. what **questions and decisions** the evaluation is intended to inform 2. the level of **complexity** of the Activity (how well do we understand the context, relationships, planned and unintended outcomes)    1. **summative evaluations** upon Activity completion for accountability purposes and decisions about the future of the Activity, and/or identify lessons for other Activities. **Independent summative evaluations are mandatory for all Activities with total MFAT investment greater than $10M**    2. **impact evaluations** could be conducted several years after Activity completion to assess its impact on longer term outcomes. |
| 1. For each M&E task above, the following should be identified:    1. **Responsibilities and roles** are clearly assigned to specific individuals (not organisations) with the required skill, time and resources to undertake the tasks    2. **Budget** is realistic and incorporated into the Activity budget (Tip: a general guideline is about 4-6% of total Activity budget could be allocated to M&E).    3. **Timeline** - these tasks are then included in the Activity’s main workplan. |

**Find out more**

This document is part of a set of MERL guidelines supporting the Business Case Approach. It is owned by the Insights, Monitoring & Evaluation Unit in the Development Capability & Insights Division (DCI). For further help or advice, please contact DCI’s MERL Advisers.

# Appendix One: Template for MERL Table with key definitions

| Results (outcomes and outputs) | Indicators and other evidence | Baseline Information | Targets | Data Collection method | Frequency of measurement | How used for management or reporting |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| What is it? | Variables that assess progress or achievement of outcomes | Describes the situation or trend **prior** to the start of the Activity. Provides evidence supporting problem analysis and enables setting realistic targets. If important baselines are not available, further research or consultation is needed. | Describes the level of intended progress, achievement, or rate of change at key stages after Activity has begun and when Activity is completed  Assessment of targets against baseline enables assessment of what difference T is making. | Source or method for collecting the data. Long-term outcomes need to align to the 4YP MERL framework and draw on existing data sources and partner systems (e.g. national development plans, SDGs). | How often the data will be collected |  |
| Long-Term Outcomes (LTO) *Purpose: Is the Activity contributing to intended long-term outcomes?* | | | | | |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Medium-Term Outcome (MTO) *Purpose: What progress is the Activity making to achieve its intended medium term outcomes?* | | | | | |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Short term outcomes | | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outputs** | | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

# Appendix Two: Template for MERL Table (with examples in blue)

| Results | Indicators and other evidence | Baseline Information | Targets | Data Collection method | Frequency of measurement | How used |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Long-Term Outcomes: *Purpose: Is the Activity contributing to intended long-term outcomes?* | | | | | |  |
| **LTO 1** Increased income of farmers in South and South-West Tanna | Average annual income of farmers in the targeted communities | Trend of average annual income over past 5 years | Increasing average annual income from year 5 | SDGs or existing stats from Vanuatu government | Depending on availability of statistics | For management & reporting |
|  | To what extent is the Activity contributing to Long-term outcomes? What external factors are also influencing? |  |  | Context monitoring by Post (ongoing), and potentially evaluation (at end of Activity)? | Ongoing monitoring, end of Activity evaluation | For management & reporting |
| Medium-Term Outcomes *Purpose: What progress is the Activity making to achieve intended medium term outcomes?* | | | | | |  |
| **Medium Term Outcome 1.** Increased productivity of farmers from improved coffee growing techniques | Average production levels from farmers who participated in the training | Trend of average annual production over past 5 years | Increasing in average annual production by X% from year 3? | Follow up survey of farmers by Implementing Partner | 1-2 years after training? | For management & reporting |
|  | Examples of difference made by Activity and why (factors that contributed to success, sustainability of benefits) | n/a | n/a | Interview with farmers who experienced improvement conducted by Implementing Partner, and/or by MFAT as part of Monitoring Visit, and/or by Evaluation | 1-2 years after training? | For management & reporting |
|  | Feedback from farmers who did not experience increased productivity on why (what barriers, external factors influenced, unintended outcomes) | n/a | n/a | Interview with farmers who did not experience improvement conducted by Implementing Partner, and/or by MFAT as part of Monitoring Visit, and/or by Evaluation | 1-2 years after training? | For management and improvement |
| **Short-Term Outcomes** | | | | | | |
| **Short term outcome 1. 1** Farmers have enhanced knowledge and understanding of improved coffee growing techniques | % of farmers trained who demonstrate improved knowledge and understanding of improved coffee growing techniques (total, M/F) | n/a | 70%? | end of training survey of participants | End of training? | For management & reporting |
| **Short term outcome 1.2**  Farmers adopt improved coffee growing techniques | % of farmers who adopted improved coffee growing techniques (total, M/F) | X% | 60%? | Follow up survey of farmers | 6 months after training? | For management & reporting |
| WHY: Feedback from farmers who did not adopt improved techniques on why, what barriers | n/a | n/a | Interview with farmers who experienced improvement conducted by Implementing Partner, and/or by MFAT as part of Monitoring Visit | 6 months after training? | For management and improvement |
| **Outputs** | | | | | | |
| **Output 1.1** Training needs assessment and plan completed | Training needs assessment and action plan completed in consultation with key stakeholders | Training needs not well understood, no plan developed | by Jan 2018  consultation completed with X, Y  BY July 2018, plan approved by the …committee | Training provider | At end of completion of assessment and plan | For management & reporting |
| **Output 1.2.** Farmers received training in improved coffee growing practices | e.g. Number of participants who completed training on … (total, M/F) | n/a | 50 per year in Years 1 and 2 | Training records administered by training provider | End of each training | For management & reporting |
| % of participants satisfied with relevance and quality of training (total number, %M/F) | n/a | 70% per year in Years 1 and 2 | end of training survey of participants | End of each training | For management & reporting |
| WHY: Feedback from participants on what they valued about the training, what needs improvement.. | n/a | n/a | end of training survey of participants | End of each training | For management and improvement |

# Appendix Three: Template for Activity MERL Work plan

| CONTINUOUS LEARNING & IMPROVEMENT | Key Purpose | Key Tasks | When | Responsible | Budget |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Gather evidence** | 1. Completion/review of **Activity MERL framework** (including indicators, baseline, targets and any research and evaluation requirements[[6]](#footnote-6)) | Drafted as part of Activity design, reviewed and agreed with implementing partner and stakeholders during inception phase | Implementing Partner (in consultation with MFAT and key stakeholders) with assistance of MERL Adviser/contractor |  |
| 1. **Context monitoring** | Regular (e.g. quarterly) monitoring | Implementing Partner | n/a |
| 1. **Baselines and regular data collection**, including smaller iterative evaluative approaches and monitoring visits for real-time feedback | As determined in MERL table | Implementing Partner with assistance of MERL Adviser/contractor |  |
| 1. Commission **research & evaluation/s** as determined in Activity MERL Table | As needed to inform Activity management and decision-making | Implementing Partner with MFAT (with assistance of MERL Adviser/contractor) |  |
| 1. **Independent monitoring visits** | As needed to inform Activity management and decision-making | MFAT |  |
| 1. **Independent evaluation (if required)** | Mandatory for Activities with total MFAT investment over $10 million | MFAT (commissions external evaluator) |  |
| **Use evidence decision-making** | 1. **Internal project team and management team discussion** on progress, issues, challenges and lessons and actions | Regularly | Implementing Partner | n/a |
| 1. **Progress report** **and discussion with MFAT** (including agreeing any revisions to MERL framework) | Report submitted to MFAT (as determined in contract) | Implementing Partner | n/a |
| 1. MFAT team **discussion of progress, risks and lessons** learned | Regularly | MFAT Activity Manager | n/a |
| 1. Completion of **Activity Monitoring Assessments (AMAs) or Activity Completion Assessments (ACAs)** | AMAs: Annually,  ACAs: at Activity completion | MFAT Activity Manager | n/a |
| **Total MERL budget** | | | | |  |

1. including MFAT Annual Assessment of Results, Australia DFAT, UK DFID, USAID, SPC, and Funnel & Rogers (2011) Purposeful Program Theory [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. see Guidance note on [Problem Analysis](http://o-wln-gdm/Activities/PoliciesandProcedures/InternationalDevelopment/Continuous%20Improvement%20Programme/2C%20-%20Infosheet%20-%20Problem%20analysis%20for%20Concept%20notes%20and%20BCs.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. [database of evaluation and research reports of MFAT activities and programmes](http://o-wln-gdm/functions/internationaldevelopment/developmentpolicy/strategicevaluationsandresearch/evaluation%20report%20database%20for%20te%20aka.xlsx) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. [Development Quality Policy](http://o-wln-gdm/Functions/InternationalDevelopment/DevelopmentPolicy/PoliciesAndStrategies/Draft%20Development%20Quality%20Policy.docx) [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. DCI’s MERL team has tools and guidelines for planning research and evaluation [– you can find these guidelines here](https://wlndrs65.orange.mfat.net.nz/p798t6zxesv/). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Examples of different types of evaluation include: to guide Programme innovation or improvements consider a formative, process or developmental evaluation; to identify Programme value, merit or impact, consider an outcome or impact evaluation. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)