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### ACRONYMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONEVAL</td>
<td>National Social Development Policy Evaluation Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LF</td>
<td>Logical Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LQAS</td>
<td>Lot Quality Assurance Sampling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MfR</td>
<td>Management for Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>National Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBB</td>
<td>Results-Based Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAGARPA</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, Rural Development, Fishing and Food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIMER</td>
<td>The Monitoring and Evaluation for Results System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSCS</td>
<td>Two-Stage Cluster Sampling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Presentation

Since the Marrakech Round Table in 2004, the international community has supported five specific commitments related to improving the effectiveness of development assistance\(^1\), synthesized in the concept of “Managing for Development Results”. This implies taking into account from the beginning of any initiative, project or program the expected outcomes and how to achieve them. Furthermore, the implementation, progress monitoring, and subsequent evaluation should consider the expected outcomes that were established at the beginning of the process.

In this regard, there is a great challenge for developing countries to adopt a new vision. This means breaking with old customs and patterns in the manner of handling the project cycle, changing from a focus on addressing demand to a planning process for achieving specific outcomes, established from the beginning. While there is no single approach, since each country, each sector and each project presents particular situations, there are experiences that can be systematized and shared.

The preparation of a set of tools for results-based management responds to the need to break with inertial operating schemes of public development programs in the majority of countries, which do not contemplate efficiency and efficacy in achieving results. The absence of such an approach implies that substantial resources are spent without a timeframe for resolving the problems that the public interventions are intended for.

This document brings together the experiences obtained from the Evaluation and Analysis of Rural Policies Project undertaken by the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and the Mexican Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, Rural Development, Fishing and Food (SAGARPA) during the implementation of the “Results-Based Management” focus in its different Programs. In this respect, on four occasions the National Council for the Evaluation of Social Development Policy of Mexico has granted recognition to SAGARPA for its good practices in the development, execution and evaluation of public policy in the field since 2007, taking an important step toward improving its programs and orienting them toward performance and impact in the rural sector.

The document “Results-based public management: Tools for the design and implementation of public rural development programs with a project cycle approach” includes the four phases of the life cycle of a project or program. The first module includes the methodological tools for conducting a sector diagnosis, which constitutes the first step that justifies the intervention by making it possible to identify a problem, dimension it, identify and quantify the population or area facing the problem, and stratify such population.

The second module presents the procedure and methodological tools for the design of a program or project which will be synthesized in the Logical framework. In this module the methodology is shown for conducting the objectives analysis and the alternatives analysis, constructing performance indicators, identifying the means of verification, identifying risk and assumptions, and collecting counterfactual data for a baseline of the performance indicators of the program or project.

The third module provides the methodology for the implementation of a program or project which, under the results approach, should include a monitoring and evaluation system consistent with its design, budgeting, and regulation, as well as design and processes evaluations in the first year of implementation of the program or project.

\(^1\) The principles of Results-Based Management agreed on during the Second Round Table on managing for development results in 2004, are: 1) focus the dialog on results in all the phases of the development process; 2) align programming, monitoring and evaluation with results; 3) keep measurement and reporting simple; 4) manage for, not by, results; and 5) use results information for learning and decision-making.
The fourth module consists of the methodology for evaluating the outcomes obtained by the program or project as a result of its implementation through the design of the results and impact evaluation of a program or project.

Each module is structured with a chapter on theory and a chapter on experience referring to the mentioned Project, and complemented with the systematization of the methodological tools for a better understanding of the sections.

Salomón Salcedo Baca
Senior Policy Officer

Alfredo González Cambero
Project Director (2007-2012)
Introduction

The establishment of objectives or expected outcomes of public policy takes place at the time of designing the programs or projects that will implement such public policy. However, no matter how well designed a program or project is that is not sufficient to achieve the results sought. A good design of the program or project is a necessary condition that is complemented with its proper implementation in order to achieve the outcomes and impacts sought.

Nevertheless, it is common to observe that the implementation of a program or project is inadequate, presenting a variety of areas for improvement. For example, the budgeting of programs or projects is generally done by inertia based on adjustments to the previous year’s budget, but without considering the dimensions of the problem to be resolved or the size of the target population to be addressed, or the intended duration of the program or project, which according to best practices should end once the situation that gave it origin is resolved. It is also common to observe that the regulation of a program or project diverges from its design, which does not contribute to achieving the outcomes sought with the implementation of such program.

Given the above, the integrated group of tools of this Module includes the technical elements that should be considered in drafting the rules of operation of a program or project, such that its design is reflected in the rules for its operation. This Module also presents the methodology for the evaluation of design and of processes, which gives feedback to the design and implementation of the program or project.

Another extremely important step for supporting decision making in the implementation of a program is monitoring the goals of a program or project based on a systematic collection and analysis of information on the program or project as it is being executed. The purpose of this is to contribute to keeping the implementation under control, identifying those aspects that require corrective measures. In other words, monitoring is an internal function of the managing of the program or project. This Module also includes the methodology for monitoring the indicators of a program or project.
I Implementation and monitoring of a program or project
Chapter 1
Methodology for the execution and monitoring of a program or project

This chapter presents the methodologies that guide the execution and monitoring processes during the phases of budgeting, regulation, design evaluation, processes evaluation and monitoring of the program or project.

The execution of a program or project is the third phase of the cycle in which the design becomes concrete and tangible actions.

FIGURE 1. PROJECT LIFE CYCLE: IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING

This chapter has five sections. The first section is a guide for coordinating the estimation of funding coherently with the achievement of results (objectives of the project) and thereby insuring the consistency between what is planned and what is budgeted. In the second section a guide is presented for establishing the rules of operation that set up the regulatory framework for operating a program or project, which permits an efficient and effective application of the funding that is assigned to such program or project. The third section contains the methodology for evaluating the design of a program or project from an analysis of consistency of its parts, and ensuring that the design is reflected in the rules
of operation; also in this section a methodological guide is presented for the design of the processes evaluation. The fourth section covers the monitoring of the progress of the program or project with respect to the original plan, utilizing for this purpose performance and processes indicators. Finally, in the fifth section the elements necessary to do an intermediate performance evaluation are presented.

1.1 Budgeting based on results

Budgeting based on Managing for Results (MfR) consists of assigning the financial resources of a program or project according to the objectives or outcomes\(^2\) that are sought with the intervention. In other words, it is the process by which a direct link is established between the desired objectives and the public budget for the financing of the actions of the program or project. The results-based approach is present in all the processes and phases of managing.

In the framework of the results-based approach it is very important that governments link the budgets of the development programs with their outcomes. This process can take years to be effectively implemented, but there are countries in Latin America and the Caribbean that are already beginning to apply the MfR principle in the government spending management process, as is the case of Mexico, Chile, Peru and Trinidad and Tobago. Below you will find the tools that Mexico and Chile have applied in order to move to an MfR approach.

1.1.1 Budgeting system adopted in Mexico

The method used in Mexico for assigning funds is Results-Based Budgeting (RBB), which is defined as the set of activities and tools that allows budget decision-making to systematically incorporate considerations of the results obtained and expected in the application of public resources and that motivates public agencies and entities to achieve those results in order to improve the quality of federal public spending and government accountability.

The RBB attempts to ensure that the center of attention and decision making always stays focused on the expected outcomes during all the stages of the budgeting process: planning, programming, budgeting, disbursement and control, follow up, evaluation and accountability.\(^3\)

In this way, the planning of RBB is focused on defining and establishing, clearly and simply, the objectives and outcomes to be reached by the development programs to which budgeted public resources are allocated. These objectives, in turn, are linked with the strategic objectives of the federal public agencies and entities and with the National Development Plan (NDP) of the country.

In the allocation of the budgetary resources both the objectives and the expected outcomes are considered, as well as the goals actually achieved by the programs that are executed. In the budgeting, a programmatic structure is established that makes it possible to organize the allocation of resources according to the classification of the programs or specific activities (Table 1).

---

\(^2\) A development result is the product, effect or impact of a development intervention.

This programmatic structure requires, in addition, the design of the Indicators for Results Matrix (or Logical Framework) in order to align the Goal, the Purpose, the Outputs and the Activities that make up a program or project; as well as the indicators, the means of verification and the risks and assumptions for each level of objectives of such program or project. The indicators are utilized for the evaluation of the achievement of the objectives and they are themselves a reference for monitoring the performance of the program.

Once the objectives and results are defined and the spending budgeted, the next step is to execute the programs and disburse the budget. For the disbursement and control of the budget an organizational dynamic is established by the public agencies and entities linking the units and areas responsible for the planning, programming, budget and evaluation with the units responsible for the execution of the programs. This provides a basis for making decisions and taking actions to ensure results by programs or projects, guaranteeing better quality in public spending.

The Monitoring and Evaluation for Results System (SIMER) is established for the follow up and evaluation of programs. The SIMER allows for feedback, which results from following up on the indicators and the results of the evaluations, from

---

**TABLE 1. GROUP AND TYPES IN THE BUDGET PROGRAMMATIC STRUCTURE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal programs</td>
<td>• Programs subject to rules of operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Other subsidy programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment projects</td>
<td>• Investment projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific activities</td>
<td>• Provision of public services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Production of public goods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Planning, formulation, implementation, follow up and evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Promotion activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Regulation and supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Activities in support of the budget process and to improve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>institutional efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Activities supporting public administration improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Federalized spending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Other relevant activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Obligations imposed by jurisdictional decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pensions and retirement funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Statutory contributions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
which elements on which to base decision making are generated. In this way, based on the performance evaluation of the programs and projects, the results of the application of public resources are known, as well as the social impact, thereby generating the means for ensuring accountability (Figure 2).

**FIGURE 2. DIAGRAM OF THE RESULTS-BASED BUDGETING PROCESS IN MEXICO**

- Alignment with the National Development Plan and its programs
- Strategic objectives of agencies and entities
- Preparation and authorization of budget programmatic structures
- Definition of the budgetary programs
- Preparation of matrix of indicators for results
- Development of strategic and process indicators
- Budget allocations based on results
- Improvement in managing and quality of spending
- Reports on results
- Monitoring of indicators
- Commitment to results and improving of managing
- Public Account of Results

1.1.2 Budgeting system adopted in Chile

The National Budget Office of the Ministry of Finance of Chile has created and introduced a set of tools designed to improve the budget analysis and to make it more transparent4.

The system adopted in Chile includes the following tools:

- **Performance indicators.** The purpose of the indicators is to provide information on the performance of the programs or projects and, in that respect, contribute to the analysis on which the preparation and discussion of the budget is based in the National Congress; for that purpose each year the Chilean Budget Law is accompanied by a group of performance indicators with their corresponding targets and degree of fulfillment, which are utilized by the National Congress for the preparation of the budget for the next period.

- **Program evaluations.** The evaluation of development programs and projects includes various lines of evaluation, among which are: program performance, impact of the interventions and comprehensive review of spending. The evaluations are done independently and are based on the Logical Framework Methodology.

- **Competitive funding** or tendering of public programs with a standard format for presenting public programming for financing, through which the Ministries prepare their budget proposals, which includes the new programs as well as substantive reformulations of existing programs. The format requires the inclusion of relevant background in order to analyze the need for and relevance of the bill presented by the Ministries.

- **Management improvement programs.** These are incentives programs that link the fulfillment of the objectives of the programs to a monetary incentive for the officers responsible for the execution of the program or project. The incentive gives an increase of 3% in the remunerations of the officers provided that the institution in which they work has a target compliance equal to or greater than 90% of the annual targets committed to, or 1.5% if such compliance is less than 90% but equal to or greater than 75%.

- **Comprehensive management reports.** All public sector agencies are required to prepare a Comprehensive Management Report for Congress. The purpose of these reports is to support the process of evaluation of financial implementation and budget management by the National Budget Office during the first semester of each year. The comprehensive management reports are also used in the evaluation of the financial management of public services by the budget subcommittees.

1.1.3 The virtuous circle of planning, budgeting and evaluation

In both Mexico and Chile a series of budget reforms have been implemented that seek to link the application of public resources through programs or projects with the outcomes obtained and expected. In both countries it is recognized that budgeting is a process that permeates the planning and evaluation phases, and therefore consistency between the allocation of the resources and the expected outcomes is promoted through different tools such as the use of logical frameworks for planning and the development of annual operating and budget strategies subject to performance, as well as impact and performance evaluations in order to give feedback to the budgeting process. In short, it is sought to link the planning and evaluation processes with the budgeting and outcomes of the programs and projects.

However, it should be mentioned that the existence of these tools alone is not sufficient for their application. In a comparative study done by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) regarding agricultural and rural policies in the international context, the agricultural and rural sector policies of Brazil, Chile, the United States, Mexico, New Zealand and the European Union were studied; in the particular case of Mexico it was found

---

that the processes of public policy and program managing are subject to a set of factors that limit the possibility of giving feedback on the formulation and implementation processes, including the allocation of public funds. Among the learned lessons through this analysis were the following:

• There is lack of awareness among public officials of the importance of the evaluation of the programs and projects in guiding public policy toward results. Among public officials, evaluation is perceived as an auditing process that is intended to qualify the performance of their administrative duties, and therefore more emphasis is placed on demonstrating the application of the resources and not on achieving the objectives of the programs or projects through the application of such resources.

• Another issue is the program implementers’ lack of knowledge of the roots of the problems that the programs and projects are intended to solve, and therefore the ultimate purpose of the evaluation is not clearly understood.

• The short and long term targets are not clearly defined. Furthermore, often targets are determined based on the historic trend shown in program execution, rather than on the intended objective outcomes, and therefore the results-based managing approach is lost, with the allocation of resources becoming an end and not a means to achieve results.

• The market of evaluators is still incipient, and therefore often the evaluators that are hired to provide evaluation services do not have the required technical profile, both in terms of technical capacity and experience, to satisfy the needs of an evaluation.

• It is common to use indicators that do not reflect the impact or the change that is sought with the application of public resources through the programs, such as “the volume of resources applied in relation to what was programmed”.

Not only in Mexico, but also in other Latin American countries such as Chile and Brazil, evidence shows that there is insufficient association between the evaluation process and the planning and budgeting of programs. For this reason, in order for the evaluation to be useful in the fulfillment of objectives and in order to improve the allocation of resources, it is essential that the evaluation be linked to planning and budgeting.

There are other experiences such as those of the European Union (EU) and New Zealand from which certain lessons can also be learned. For example, in the case of the European Union the evaluation quality control mechanism stands out. The regulatory framework establishes the requirement that the allocation of resources to different programs be supported by ex-ante evaluations in order to know the expected impact. It is also required to do ex-post evaluations. The results of the evaluations are public and they are found on the Web site of the EU, thereby contributing to transparency and legitimacy. Furthermore, in the European Union they have tried to prevent diversion from the stated purposes by applying a penalties system, reinforced with information flows to taxpayers through the Web site.

In the case of New Zealand, an evaluation is done at the end of the fiscal period with the Annual Report which, in addition to providing information on the specific outcomes with respect to the program implemented, allows for the redirecting of actions in the event that fulfillment of the objectives is not as expected. New Zealand also has a system of incentives and penalties which plays a decisive role in the successful implementation of the sector policy.

In conclusion, in order for the budgeting system to function in full alignment with the expected outcomes of a particular public program, it should rest on a dynamic regulatory framework that recognizes the strategic stakeholders of each program whose collaboration influences the success of its implementation. Stakeholders can be public or private, as well as organizations of civil society, of producers or of companies. It is important to foster coordination, under the leadership of the responsible Ministry, among all stakeholders and with the entity responsible for preparing the budgets. Furthermore, it is necessary to have a penalties and incentives system that promotes a positive attitude toward meeting the objectives of the programs and projects and encourages paying attention to the evaluation and its results.

\[5\] FAO-SAGARPA. 2012. Las políticas agropecuarias y rurales en el contexto internacional: un análisis comparativo.
1.2 Regulation

The rules of operation of programs or projects are a set of regulatory provisions that indicate how to operate them in order to ensure an efficient and effective application of the resources allocated for them. The regulations that govern a program or project must be consistent with the relevant information summarized in the Logical framework (LF) which should have been generated during the design phase of such program. In other words, information from which the rules of operation are constructed can be found in the LF (Figure 3).

The rules under which a program or project operates vary according to the objective to be achieved, the target population to be reached, the characteristics of the goods and services the program provides, the inter-institutional coordination on which the execution of the program depends and the type and timing of the evaluation that is contemplated for the program or project, among other provisions that are applied for each particular intervention. Nevertheless, whatever the guidelines are, they should be consistent with the diagnosis and design processes, as the principle of alignment of the MfR approach indicates. The process of linking the Logical Framework to budgetary programs is described below (Table 2).
TABLE 2. GUIDELINES FOR GOING FROM THE LOGICAL FRAMEWORK TO THE RULES OF OPERATION OF THE CORRESPONDING PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sections of the Rules of Operation</th>
<th>General contents</th>
<th>Link with the Logical Framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction</strong></td>
<td>Specific problem that is addressed with the implementation of the program or project. Such problem must coincide with the one identified through the diagnosis that is carried out prior to designing the program or project. For that purpose the introduction should contain information by which the following questions can be answered unambiguously: Why does the problem exist? What was the program created for? What is the potential population; that is, the one suffering from the problem identified and therefore eligible for the program or project?</td>
<td>The specific problem that is addressed with the implementation of the program should coincide with the one described through the Logical Framework Methodology, utilizing as reference the Problem Tree; in other words, the methodology that the program utilizes to identify the problem, so that the question on the relevance of the program or project can be answered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **General Objective**             | Establishes the Goal or intention of the program in terms of its economic or social impact, which is achieved from the implementation of a group of programs. | • Establishes the Goal in the Logical Framework.  
• Should be aligned with the objectives derived from the national planning process, and be associated with one or more indicators and targets.  
• From the Goal it should be possible to infer the problem identified and which the program contributes to resolving through its execution. |
| **Specific Objective**            | Statement that establishes the Purpose to be achieved with the program. | • The specific objective of the program should coincide with the one recorded in the narrative summary at the Purpose level in the Logical Framework.  
• From the Purpose it should be possible to infer the problem identified and which the program resolves through its execution. |
### Sections of the Rules of Operation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>General contents</th>
<th>Link with the Logical Framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geographic scope of application of program: national, regional or state.</td>
<td>Should be consistent with the information described in the problem identified through the Logical Framework Methodology in the sense of the geographic sphere where the population or area affected by the problem is located.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target population or focus area</th>
<th>General contents</th>
<th>Link with the Logical Framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Specifies the characteristics of the population or focus area(^6) to which the program is directed, population being understood as organizations, persons, etc.</td>
<td>This target population (or focus area) should be consistent with the one identified at the Purpose level in the Logical Framework, clearly specifying to whom the program is directed; in other words, whom it is intended to influence in terms of changing from the current situation to the desired situation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In the case of persons, it is recommended to specify the principal socio-demographic characteristics so that it is possible to establish criteria for the recognition of the target population.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The target population can correspond to the potential population as a whole or be a subgroup of it when criteria for further targeting are established.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligibility requirements</th>
<th>General contents</th>
<th>Link with the Logical Framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The conditions that petitioners must meet in order to have access to the benefits of the program.</td>
<td>It should be ensured that the eligibility requirements are consistent with the socio-economic characteristics of the potential population that was identified in the problem analysis done as part of the Logical Framework Methodology. Verifying this concurrence makes it possible to ensure that the population really in need of the aid is not excluded.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• First of all, to be eligible it is required to be part of the potential population group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Secondly, if further targeting has been done, to be eligible it is necessary to belong to the target population group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^6\) The focus area refers to targeted areas, for instance, in the case of natural resources the problem is presented by areas or land areas, not by persons.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sections of the Rules of Operation</th>
<th>General contents</th>
<th>Link with the Logical Framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Procedure for selecting beneficiaries | - The beneficiaries should be selected from within the potential population group that was identified in the diagnosis used to identify the problem; or in the population group that had been further targeted.  
- The selection criteria should be clear and objective.  
- The selection criteria should be in agreement with the socio-economic characteristics of the potential or target population if further targeting has been done. | Not applicable. |
| Characteristics of the goods and services provided by the program or project | - The different Outputs, either in cash or in kind, should be defined, indicating amounts or units to be delivered per potential beneficiary.  
- Presented simply and schematically classifying the types, the amounts and the conditions of their granting.  
- In case of segmentation of the target population, the characteristics of the goods and services should be established for each segment if differentiation is made. | Corresponds to the Outputs of the Logical Framework. |
| Rights, obligations and penalties applicable to the potential beneficiary population | - The rights and commitments that are acquired upon obtaining the benefits that the program or project provides.  
- The penalties that will be applied in case of failure to meet the obligations agreed upon by the population that accepts the benefits of the program or project are established. | Not applicable. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sections of the Rules of Operation</th>
<th>General contents</th>
<th>Link with the Logical Framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Implementers and regulatory entity** | • The operators of the program or project are established, and they are considered the implementers.  
• The area responsible for the execution of the project or program is identified, it being considered the regulatory entity.  
• The government agency or entity that will define the aspects that regulate the execution of the program is specified. | Not applicable. |
| **Institutional coordination** | • The coordination mechanisms necessary to guarantee that the programs and actions do not contradict, affect or duplicate other public programs or actions are established.  
• The coordination involves the different levels of government (federal, state or provincial and municipal). | If institutional coordination is vital for the execution of the program or project, this should be indicated in the Risks and Assumptions established in the Logical Framework in the sense that it is assumed that the inter-institutional coordination for the implementation of the program or project is viable. |
| **Implementation** | • The process is established for the implementation of the program. In this phase the stages that should be followed in the execution of the program are described chronologically, identifying the actors and times for each stage of the program execution.  
• The steps that are followed from the submission of the request of the possible beneficiary to the reception of the aid by the latter and, if applicable, the delivery of reports on the follow up on the goods and services received, are described clearly and precisely. | Corresponds to the Activities in the narrative summary to produce the Outputs. The information on the implementation of the program or project should be consistent with the principal Activities identified in the Logical Framework. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sections of the Rules of Operation</th>
<th>General contents</th>
<th>Link with the Logical Framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Additionally, the reports that should be made by the agencies responsible for the execution are included, such as:  
  • Coverage progress,  
  • Certificate of delivery-reception,  
  • Closing of the fiscal year and  
  • Funding not accrued. | | |
| Audit, control and monitoring | The mechanisms of review and supervision of the public resources that the program or project manage are established. | Corresponds to the monitoring of the performance of the program or project and for which the indicators and targets established for evaluating the progress in achieving the objectives are used. |
| Evaluation | • Includes the spheres of the formative evaluation (of processes or managing) and the summative evaluation (of outcomes or impacts).  
  • The scope of the evaluation of the program or project regarding the achievement of the objectives is established, which may be:  
    • Internal evaluation: Designed and implemented by the implementing agency in order to monitor the performance of the program. Specific indicators are included so that it is possible to evaluate the meeting of the targets and the fulfillment of the objectives.  
    • External evaluation: Also designed for determining the achievement of targets and objectives in terms of the performance of the program or project; differentiated from the internal evaluation since it is done independently by specialized agencies external to the program or project in order to provide externality to the results of the evaluation. | • The central elements of the evaluation of the program or project are given by their indicators and targets corresponding to the levels of the narrative summary of the Logical Framework.  
  • The indicators for the levels of Goal and Purpose are used for the summative evaluation.  
  • The indicators for the levels of Outputs and Activities are used for the formative evaluation. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sections of the Rules of Operation</th>
<th>General contents</th>
<th>Link with the Logical Framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Transparency and accountability   | Establishes that it is mandatory to inform the public about the performance of the program or project and for which the following activities can be specified:  
*Disclosure:* consisting of disclosing detailed information on the program, such as coverage progress (disbursement and number of beneficiaries).  
*Social control:* Consists of the set of actions that citizens take, either individually or as an organization, in order to actively participate in the oversight and control of government actions; in this case in relation to the implementation and outcomes of the program or project. | Not applicable. |
| Complaints and reporting of irregularities | Mechanisms are established through which citizens can present complaints and reports of irregularities or give notice of possible violations, becoming supervisors of the progress toward fulfilling the objectives of the program. | Not applicable. |

Source: Prepared by author from the document prepared by the Consejo Nacional de Evaluación de la Política de Desarrollo Social (CONEVAL) of Mexico.

**FOR MORE INFORMATION:**


### 1.3 Management evaluation

Although the evaluation of a program corresponds to the fourth stage of the project cycle, during the implementation of a program it is advisable to evaluate certain aspects of the program or project in order to use the results of such evaluation to provide information on the progress of the program toward the outcomes sought. In this regard, the management evaluation of managing includes the evaluation of design and the evaluation of processes.
The evaluation would not have value if its results are not incorporated into the decision making of the program or project, as for example in the redesign of the program or in the introduction of changes in the processes of the program that make it more efficient. In this regard, it is important to evaluate if procedures are established for incorporating the findings of the evaluations into the decision making for the improvement of the program.

It is important to take into account the relationship between the outcomes and impacts of the program and its management. Therefore, throughout the analysis of the processes evaluation topics it is necessary to establish whether the management is contributing to the achievement of the results and objectives of the program. The diagram below shows the relationship between the efficiency and effectiveness in the management of a program, and the manner of coordinating the impacts evaluation with the management evaluation (Figure 4).

1.3.1 Design evaluation

The evaluation of the design of a program or project is an instrument that helps assess and reflect on the design of an intervention in order to verify if the elements of the design are behaving as expected. Therefore, this evaluation is done before or immediately after the implementation of the program. The design evaluation includes an internal consistency analysis which would either corroborate the relevance of the design of the program for the purpose it was created or lead to proposals that provide a basis for improving the design of a program or project. It is also intended to confirm the consistency of the internal logic of the design, verifying, among other things, the horizontal relationship and the vertical relationship of the Logical framework of the project so that they are coherent with respect to what it is sought to achieve and with respect to how such achievements should be measured.

A program exists because there is a problem to be solved. In this regard, the first evaluation to be done is of the program or project design, in which one of the first evaluation topics to be addressed is whether the problem exists and whether the problem that the program or project addresses and seeks to solve has been identified and diagnosed. This may seem obvious, but it is in fact extremely important because it is common to see programs that are operating by inertia or by “budgetary custom”. Once the problem that the program addresses is identified, it is also important to determine
if it is correctly diagnosed and, therefore, dimensioned, through a study or a diagnosis that identifies the cause and effect relationships regarding the identified problem. Questions such as those suggested in Table 3 make it possible to formulate the topics of evaluation that correspond to the justification of the program or project.

The internal consistency of the design also has to be evaluated, which means assessing whether it is correctly structured and whether it effectively synthesizes the principal elements of the design. This involves analyzing whether the objectives of the program are formulated clearly and if they express the situation that it is sought to achieve in the objective population or focus area of the program.

When the program has a Logical Framework, the next step is to verify the vertical logic, assessing whether on each level of objectives of the narrative summary (Activities, Outputs, Purpose and Goal) the necessary and sufficient conditions are satisfied to achieve the objective of the highest level according to the theory of change. For its part, the analysis of the horizontal logic consists of evaluating whether the indicators selected are the best ones for measuring the achievement of the objectives of the program or project, and whether the necessary and sufficient means of verification for obtaining the data required for calculating such indicators have been identified. In the evaluation of the vertical and horizontal logic it is important to refer to the Logical Framework Methodology.

In those situations in which the program does not have a Logical Framework, it is a good idea to reconstruct such framework in order to have a tool for analysis. From inferences on the hierarchy of the objectives and the effects of the goods and services provided by the program it is possible to arrive at a Logical Framework from which the internal consistency of the design of the program or project can be assessed. This means reconstructing the LF.

If the program contemplates targeting its service, it is necessary to determine if the target population has been defined and quantified, as well as the method and criteria for such targeting. It is important to have in mind that the target population should be a subset of the potential population, which may be inclusive of such potential population, but never outside of its definition. The targeting should also be done using clear technical criteria that explain such targeting. When targeting does not include the entire potential, and therefore eligible, population, it is necessary to justify why a certain eligible population is excluded from the benefits of the program or project. In this regard the targeting criteria are also subject to evaluation.

Furthermore, given that the program that is evaluated generally forms part of a broader public policy, it is advisable to evaluate the relationships that may exist between the program and other programs and projects related to the same sector in order to determine if there are any complementary, duplicative or counteracting relationships between them.

Once the internal consistency of the program or project is evaluated, it is also necessary to evaluate the relationship that the program or project has with the public policy that gives context to the program. In this regard, it is analyzed to what extent the objectives of the program that is evaluated contribute to the achievement of superior or strategic objectives, such as those established in a sectoral program or in a national development program. Table 3 presents a summary of the basic evaluation topics and some sample questions of the design evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation topics</th>
<th>Evaluation questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justification of the creation of the program or project</td>
<td>What is the problem it is sought to solve; that is, the problem that justifies the creation of the program?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the problem correctly diagnosed and dimensioned?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the potential population (that presents the problem) identified and quantified?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the problem relevant in the framework of the development priorities?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Evaluation topics vs Evaluation questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal consistency of the program or project</th>
<th>Does the program or project address the problem detected through the diagnosis?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the internal logic of the design valid, both vertically and horizontally?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>According to the theory of change is it possible to determine the how and why in the narrative summary of the Logical Framework of the program or project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are the goods and services the program delivers necessary and sufficient for solving the problem identified, as well as its causes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do the actions of the program or project affect a population and/or focus area specific to the problem?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution of the program to higher objectives</td>
<td>Does the program contribute, and how, to higher objectives or strategies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the insertion and contribution of the program to the promotion of the objectives of the sector policy clear?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential population and objective of the program</td>
<td>Is the potential population identified and quantified?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the potential population correspond to the population that presents the problem that justifies the creation of the program?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the target population defined and quantified?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with other programs and projects</td>
<td>Are complementary relationships with other programs or projects in the context of the problem addressed by the program identified?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are duplication relationships with other programs or projects identified?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are counteracting relationships with other programs or projects in the context of the problem addressed by the program identified?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is it intended to carry out synergetic actions with other programs?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### How to develop a design evaluation

The first step consists of determining the objectives of the evaluation. In a design evaluation the main points that should be assessed are:

- The clear identification of the development problem that justifies the existence of the program or project.
- The contribution of the program or project to the higher development objectives in the public policies framework, for example to the national or sectoral strategy.
- The internal logic of the Logical Framework (vertical, horizontal and diagonal) of the program or project.
- The correlation between the design and the regulation (rules of operation) of the program or project.
- The relationship with other programs or projects in order to determine possible duplication or complementarity among them.
Once the objectives of the evaluation are established, the methodology is determined, which includes the establishment of central criteria that will guide the evaluation and the methods for obtaining the information that will support the analysis, such as the review of documentary information, interviews with relevant stakeholders of the program or project in question, focus groups or direct observation.

**FOR MORE INFORMATION:**


### 1.3.2 Processes evaluation

In addition to a good design, it is necessary that the program or project be implemented correctly in order to guarantee the fulfillment of the targets and the achievement of the objectives. The purpose of this analysis is to know in depth how the processes are executed in order to issue recommendations for increasing the efficiency of the implementation and the effectiveness of the program processes so that they lead to achieving the Purpose. Therefore, the evaluation of processes centers on the analysis of the form and extent to which the implementation of the program influences or impacts the fulfillment of its objectives from the perspective of the functioning and organization of its operative dynamic. Specifically, through this evaluation an analysis of the implementation of the project is done, detecting any problems that are obstructing the processes and finding solutions in order to change the regulation of the program or project for purposes of correcting its management.

The processes evaluation also assesses if the implementation of the program or project is carried out effectively and identifies the strengths and best practices that enhance the effectiveness of the implementation of such program. In general terms, the evaluation should make it possible to determine if each process: i) is done efficiently; that is, if resource waste is avoided; ii) is correctly linked with the other processes and iii) is carried out effectively; that is, if doing it contributes to the fulfillment of the objectives sought, both for each process and for the program as a whole.

It is important to take into account in defining the general objective of any processes evaluation that its ultimate purpose is to find courses of action, through the readjustment of the regulatory instruments, that help achieve the results of the program or project efficiently and effectively, thereby solving the problem for which it was designed. In this regard, the evaluation is a strategic tool for acquiring and constructing knowledge to give feedback to decision making and to encourage institutional learning.

The primary components of the processes evaluation are the following:

- **Description of the implementation of the project.** Consists of a general description including the political, cultural and financial conditions of the implementation; the institutions or organizations involved in the implementation; the inter-institutional coordination; and the human, financial and infrastructure resources of the project.

---

7 In the Mexican evaluation experience, these components are established by the National Social Development Policy Evaluation Council (CONEVAL) in its terms of reference for the evaluation of processes.
• **Description of processes.** Consists of describing one by one the implementing processes that make up the project. The context in which they are developed, their inputs, their products and the stakeholders involved are all described.

• **Identification and classification of processes.** The processes can be classified according to their function. For example: planning, dissemination, selection of beneficiaries, production and distribution of the goods or services, following up on the goods and services provided, following up on the beneficiaries, monitoring and supervision, etc.

• **Analysis of the nature of the processes.** The nature of each process is analyzed in terms of effectiveness (meeting the targets associated with the processes) and sufficiency (minimum elements required for the generation of products).

• **Global analysis of the implementation.** This is the global assessment of the implementation of the program or project. An analysis is done of why certain processes do not adequately lead to the achievement of the Purpose. The areas of opportunity for improving the implementation of the program or project are also analyzed, as well as the best practices or strengths.

The development of these evaluation topics requires that the evaluator make use of primary information, which can be collected in the field through direct observation, surveys or interviews with the stakeholders involved, and through secondary information such as regulatory documents, progress reports, information systems and prior evaluations, among other sources of information.

**How to do a processes evaluation**

To do a processes evaluation, first of all the objective and scope of the evaluation are established, followed by the definition of the evaluation topics and questions, the methodological guidelines and the general aspects to consider in the evaluation.

**1.3.3 Definition of objectives and scope of the evaluation**

In the first phase of the design of a processes evaluation it is necessary to clearly define: a) the objectives, b) the approach and c) the scope.

**a) Objectives**

**General objective:** Commonly, the purpose of the processes evaluation is to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the implementation of a program or project. For that, the general objective should specify the what, the how and the why of the processes evaluation. It is important to clearly specify such elements of the objective, since the results, the methodological guidelines and the recommendations will emerge from their subsequent development.

**Specific objectives:** The specific objectives of the management or processes stem from the general objective. It is important that the specific objectives be sufficient and necessary to achieve the general objective, and therefore care should be taken regarding the pertinence and relevance of the specific objectives in the context of the general objective. Given the nature of the processes evaluation, in general the specific objectives include aspects of the evaluation that have to do with the following areas of analysis:
• **The mapping of processes.** One of the functions of the processes evaluation is to diagnose the institutional arrangement and the processes and mechanisms of interaction between agencies, as well as to assess the physical and material resources available for each Activity, among other aspects. This makes it possible to detect areas of opportunity for improving the management of a program within the group of Activities that are carried out.

• **Analysis of causality mechanisms.** Another function of the evaluation is to assess the effectiveness of the alternatives for achieving the desired situation through the implementation of the program or project. Establishing the causality of effects makes it possible to issue precise recommendations directed toward correcting the root of the development problem that the program or project intends to solve and not just to palliate the symptoms of such problem. The use of the theory of change is useful in the analysis of the causality mechanisms.

• **Implementation of key aspects of the design.** Another of the specific objectives of the evaluation is the assessment of the implementation of the key elements of the design; for example, the assessment of the coverage in terms of the population actually served by the program versus the target population, the provision of goods and services in order to produce the Outputs, etc.

It is important that the objectives, both general and specific, be set out as such; in other words, as situations reached and not as actions or evaluation activities.

### b) Evaluation approach

Evaluations are useful and achieve their objectives to the extent that they constitute inputs for decision making of the various agents involved in managing the programs or projects. To achieve this, the design of the evaluation should consider the following approach aspects:

• **Practical utility.** The evaluation should result in specific, relevant and viable recommendations and proposals for implementing in a specific context. Great ideas that are unrelated to the specific context of application are not useful.

• **Timeliness.** An excellent evaluation would be of little use if its results become known late; therefore, a flow of results deliveries should be established according to the different objectives set forth based on the feasibility of the resources available for the evaluation, both financial and in terms of time. Thus, in the course of the evaluation it is relevant to present partial findings and preliminary recommendations that aid in timely decision making.

• **Participatory approach.** One relevant aspect to provide for in the design of the evaluation is the participatory nature or approach in carrying it out. In other words, it should consider the involvement of the implementing and regulatory agencies of the programs to be evaluated. Such participation initiates with the joint definition of the topics to be evaluated and continues throughout the process with periodic feedback among evaluators and relevant stakeholders of the program or project evaluated. The participatory focus makes it possible to include the evaluation topics that are of interest to the stakeholders and, therefore, useful for the users of the evaluation. It is very important, however, to preserve the independence of the evaluator in spite of the necessary close consultation with the implementers of the program or project.

• **Methodological rigor.** Whether it is the quantitative or qualitative method or mixed methods, it is important that the methodology followed for the evaluation be rigorous, which provides a basis for reliable and credible results.

### c) Scope of the evaluation

One of the elements to consider in defining the scope of a processes evaluation is the need to establish the degree of liberty in the analysis. In other words, the scope should be delineated from the evaluation design if:
- An evaluation is done that takes the design and regulations governing the program as given and, therefore, evaluates whether the actions actually taken coincide with what is established in the design and regulations; or,
- An evaluation is done that includes an analysis of the design and regulation of the program, and their relevance in achieving the purposes intended is evaluated. In this case, the evaluation should contain economic, public policy and organizational analyses, since there is a greater degree of liberty in the scope of the evaluation.

### 1.3.4 Definition of the evaluation topics

Defining and delineating precisely the topics of evaluation is essential in order to avoid the dispersion of efforts and the dilution of the effectiveness of the evaluation. In the definition of the topics it is important to consider the initial motivation for the evaluation process and the objectives that have been set for it. Answering the question “why do a processes evaluation?” initiates the process of delineating the topics of analysis.

Below the basic steps for defining and organizing the topics of a processes evaluation are presented. Once the processes are identified, the topics of evaluation that generally correspond to the management of a program or project are specified (Table 3).

#### a) Planning

Planning is a stage of the administrative process that establishes procedures and resources to carry out the actions necessary to obtain the results sought according to the objectives set forth in the design of the program or project.

In the area of planning evaluation, first of all it is necessary to determine the existence of planning processes and, from their existence, identify aspects that could be subject to evaluation and that provide information useful for decision making in regard to planning the program or project. In this respect, it is assessed whether the program or project has any planning strategy that allows it to direct its actions toward the outcomes that are sought. Said in another way, it is sought to determine if the program is supported, for its execution, in work plans and/or programs that contain clear implementation strategies and that lead to the achievement of the objectives sought after.

Among the elements that the planning should contemplate is a coverage plan; that is, an implementing strategy that allows the program or project to serve the target population. Planning should also contemplate how the performance of the program will be monitored. In this regard, it is evaluated whether the strategic plan and the work program contemplate targets and indicators, and whether the targets are adequate in the sense that they are reachable or have not been adjusted in order to be reached without the necessary effort.

Furthermore, given that in the planning for the execution of a program different actors participate, it is important to evaluate the appropriateness of the institutional setting on which the program rests. For example, the pertinence and relevance of the actors responsible for doing the planning, as well as the responsibilities assigned to them, is something that should be assessed.

Regarding the allocation of resources, an analysis should be done of how the process of budgeting the program or project is carried out, having in mind its focus on results. For this purpose it is important that the budget be sufficient to address the problem according to its dimension and to the size of the target population that has been determined. Thus, the objective of the evaluation of the allocation of resources is to determine if from the planning perspective it is envisaged to direct or target resources according to the objectives and priorities established by the program or project.

Finally, another important aspect of evaluation in the area of planning is the regulation of the program or project. In this respect, it is analyzed whether the regulating instrument of the program ensures that the key elements of the design are implemented so that the objectives of the program are achieved efficiently and effectively. For that it is also necessary to assess if the regulation of the program identifies the central elements of the design and whether the relevant procedures
and mechanisms are established so that compliance with the regulation guarantees that the key elements of the design are implemented and all the actions carried out contribute to achieving the objectives. Table 4 presents a summary of the basic evaluation topics and some sample evaluation questions in the area of planning.

### TABLE 4. EVALUATION TOPICS AND QUESTIONS IN THE AREA OF PLANNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation topics</th>
<th>Evaluation questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Institutional setting     | Who are the actors responsible for planning?  
                                What is the pertinence and relevance of the actors and the division of responsibilities in the planning of the program? |
| Allocation of resources   | What are the criteria based on which the resources of the program or project are allocated?  
                                Are the criteria for allocation of resources clearly defined in the sense that they are sufficient and necessary for the implementation and for achieving the objectives or are they determined based on past trends?  
                                Is the allocation of resources guided by the dimension of the problem and its causes; in other words, is it consistent with the objectives sought to achieve?  
                                Are the budgeted amounts sufficient for achieving the established objectives and targets?  
                                Is the opportunity cost of the resources taken into account when they are allocated? |
| Targets and indicators    | Are targets defined for achieving the objectives of the program or project?  
                                Are pertinent and relevant indicators established to monitor the progress of the program and evaluate its outcomes and impact?  
                                Are baselines or referential measurements of the indicators established for purposes of monitoring and subsequent evaluation? |
| Regulation of the program | Is it possible to identify in the regulation of the program the key elements of its design; in other words, is the Logical Framework of the program reflected in the regulations of the program or project?  
                                Are the indicators and targets of the program mandated?  
                                Is the regulation of the program consistent with the results-based approach of the program?  
                                Is the regulation of the program consistent with the socio-economic characteristics of the target population?  
                                Are there eligibility criteria for the potential beneficiaries of the program and are they clear?  
                                Are there criteria for selection of beneficiaries and are they clearly stated?  
                                Are the eligibility and selection criteria of beneficiaries consistent with the socio-economic characteristics of the target population?  
                                Are follow up actions on the goods and services granted by the program provided for?  
                                Does the regulation governing the program provide for the modification of the program or project depending on the results of the evaluations? |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation topics</th>
<th>Evaluation questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Strategic planning | Is there a strategic plan for implementing the program?  
If there is, does the strategic plan specify the financial, material and human resources to be used in the implementation of the program as well as their availability?  
If there is, do the strategic plan and work plan contemplate the supervision and follow up on the goods and services provided by the program?  
Is there a strategic plan for the implementation of the program or project that specifies a coverage plan for the target population or focus area; short, medium and long term targets; and monitoring of results?  
If there is, is program planning oriented toward the achievement of results?  
Are work plans developed for the different stages of the implementation of the program?  
If there are, do the work plans contain the necessary elements which, if followed, would ensure the achievement of the expected outcomes of the program?  
Are there any clear flow charts and are they complied with? |

b) Implementation

In the sphere of implementation, the evaluation seeks to determine if the program is being executed in such a way as to achieve the expected outcomes; in other words, if the implementation responds to the design. For that, a review is done of the different phases of the decision-making chain, from the dissemination of the program, the reception of requests until the selection of beneficiaries and the delivery of the goods and services. The evaluation of the implementation should take the regulation of the program as a reference point because it is intended to ensure that the program or project is implemented in such a way as to achieve the expected results.

Except in the case of a very small program, it is expected that various actors and agencies will participate in the implementation of a program or project. That makes it important to evaluate the institutional setting as part of the implementation. First of all it should be asked if the implementing agencies specified in the program or project regulation have been created and, if so, what is the pertinence and relevance of the actors and the division of responsibilities among them in the implementation of the program or project. The coordination of the actors in achieving the expected objectives should also be assessed. It is common for conflicts to arise among the actors participating in the execution of a program as to the scope of collaboration, which makes it relevant to assess the level of collaboration or conflict among the implementing agencies since that is likely to affect the degree of success in implementing the program.

The process of selecting beneficiaries to have access to the goods and services that a program provides is also a central topic of the implementation, since the proper selection largely determines that the resources are used for the intended purposes and, therefore, that the desired impacts are achieved. In this respect, it is necessary to assess whether the selection criteria for beneficiaries and the procedures for determining their eligibility and their level of priority with respect to the other petitioners are clearly established. It is also important to evaluate if the beneficiary selection process is transparent.

The process of delivery of the goods, services or resources that the program provides should also be assessed in order to determine opportunities for improvement in the service, the quality of the products delivered, and the consistency between what the program offers and what the beneficiaries receive, among other aspects.
In the case of decision making, it is important to assess the mechanisms for including the findings of the evaluations as inputs for decision making on the direction and implementation of the program.

Another important aspect in the evaluation has to do with assessing if, as part of the execution of the program, the information that the program generates in each of its implementation stages, from the dissemination of the program to the delivery and follow up of the goods and services delivered, is recorded and systematized such that the systematized information is sufficient in quantity, quality and timeliness to provide feedback to the implementation. Such information should also be useful for monitoring targets and, therefore, achieving the objectives of the program.

The evaluation of the implementation of the program also includes analyzing its implementing capacity with regard to the sufficiency of both the human and the material resources. For that purpose, it is important to evaluate the real implementing capacity of the responsible units of the organization executing the program or project, assessing the pertinence and sufficiency of the human, financial and material resources that are actually available for the execution of the program activities. With respect to human resources, the correlation of their profile with the tasks to be done and the sufficiency of personnel in number should be assessed. It is important to determine the time that each agent really gives to the activities related to the program, without forgetting that in many cases the implementers carry out other tasks. This analysis should reveal whether the staff for implementing the program will allow the program to meet its objectives.

The implementing capacity is also determined by the available material resources; for example, whether the information technology (IT) and office equipment is sufficient to carry out the activities, among other aspects. The items analyzed under this topic should be specific to the needs of the program being evaluated.

In summary, the purpose of the processes evaluation is to know if the program is being executed efficiently and effectively by the implementers in the different links of the decision-making chain or managing circuit. In this regard, the evaluation of the implementation should result in specific and viable recommendations of actions to improve the implementation processes, making them more efficient and increasing the likelihood of program impact. The idea is to detect areas of opportunity in relevant processes that when implemented result in a reduction in the response times to the users of the program or project, a decrease in operating costs, strict compliance with the rules of the program and better service to its users or target population. Table 5 presents a summary of the basic evaluation topics and some sample evaluation questions in the implementation area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation topics</th>
<th>Evaluation questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional setting</td>
<td>Is it consistent with the design of the program?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have the implementers envisioned in the regulations been created?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is the pertinence and relevance of the actors and the division of responsibilities in the implementation of the program?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the distribution of responsibilities among the implementers that participate in the operation of the program clear?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is there institutional capacity to carry out the tasks?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are the different areas responsible coordinated to achieve the objectives of the program?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is the level of collaboration or conflict among the implementers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the program implemented according to its regulations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation topics</td>
<td>Evaluation questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Installed capacities</strong></td>
<td>Are the execution processes of the program carried out with efficiency and efficacy by the implementers in the different levels of decision making (reception of requests, decisions on requests, mechanisms for delivering goods and services to beneficiaries, etc.) in order to achieve the proposed objectives? Are there incentive schemes to promote institutional learning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency of the processes</strong></td>
<td>Is the available information technology and office equipment sufficient to carry out the implementing activities of the program or project? Does the program have sufficient material resources in quantity and quality to carry out the implementation of the program efficiently? Does the program have the personnel qualified to carry out the implementation tasks?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision making</strong></td>
<td>Are the processes to reach the objectives through the allocation of resources carried out at the least cost possible; in other words, is managing efficient?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dissemination of the program</strong></td>
<td>Are there mechanisms to include the findings of the evaluations as an input for decision making on the focus and implementation of the program? Are the criteria established in the design and planning of the program used for decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service windows</strong></td>
<td>Is there a program dissemination process? Are the means used to disseminate the program relevant given the characteristics of the target population? Is the information disseminated on the program sufficient so that the target population knows about the benefits of the program and the manner of accessing it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery of the goods and services</strong></td>
<td>Is the location of the service windows known by the target population? Do the location and the hours of the service windows allow for an equitable coverage from a gender perspective? Are the filings and documents necessary to have access to the program standardized? Do the service windows have the material and human resources necessary to carry out their tasks?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery of the goods and services</strong></td>
<td>Are there clear procedures and deadlines for delivery of the goods and services of the program? Are the products delivered according to the regulations? Is the information given to the beneficiaries clear and timely? Are the mechanisms and times of delivery relevant given the socioeconomic characteristics of the beneficiaries?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c) Monitoring and evaluation

In a results-based implementation scheme it is essential to include tasks for following up on the achievement of the program or project objectives. For that it is necessary to have monitoring and evaluation systems that collect relevant information on the progress of the program in relation to its management and outcomes. However, the existence of the information is not enough by itself to follow up on the performance of a program. For that the implementers of the program or project must timely use the information generated to identify emerging problems and introduce corrective measures that improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the program and contribute to achieving the expected results.

The evaluation of the outcomes and impacts, addressed in Module IV, is the final managing process and it seeks to know, explain and assess the outcomes and impact of the program or project. The purpose of this evaluation is to provide information for decision making, thereby contributing recommendations for improving the future performance of the program. In this respect it is necessary to determine if the program provides for periodic evaluation processes and if actions are taken for collecting information for monitoring and evaluation purposes. Equally important is assessing if the databases, a result of such information collection, are systematized both for the monitoring and for the evaluation of outcomes and impacts. Table 6 presents a summary of the basic evaluation topics and some sample evaluation questions in the monitoring and evaluation area.

**Table 6. Evaluation Topics and Questions in the Area of Monitoring and Evaluation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation topics</th>
<th>Evaluation questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td>Are there mechanisms established for the monitoring of the implementation and disbursement of resources?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the information generated and systematized used for monitoring the program?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are there processes established for periodic evaluation of the program?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evaluation topics vs. Evaluation questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation topics</th>
<th>Evaluation questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are the resources provided for carrying out the evaluation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are actions taken for collecting information for purposes of evaluation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there systematized databases for measuring impacts?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the information generated and systematized used to evaluate the program?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there procedures established for incorporating the findings of the evaluations in the decision making for the improvement of the program?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.3.5 Methodological aspects of the processes evaluation

In this section some methodological options for the management evaluation are presented. The development of methodological instruments for the management evaluation depend on the objectives and scope established for this. The time required and the budget available for carrying out the evaluation are also elements to consider when establishing the methodology that will be followed for the evaluation.

#### 1.3.5.1 Collecting information

In this section some options for collecting relevant information to carry out the management evaluation of a program or project are presented.

**a) Documentary information**

The documentary information and its analysis is an important part of the management evaluation. The areas of evaluation, such as the design and planning of a program or project depend entirely on the availability of documentary information. In this regard, it is key to collect and review documents such as national and state development programs, sectoral programs, work plans of the programs or projects, manuals and rules of operation, organizational and functional structure of the entities that implement the programs or projects, the budget, organizational and procedures manuals, minutes of work group meetings of the different agencies that participate in the program or project being evaluated, and external and internal evaluations, among other documents of interest for the evaluation. Based on the information contained in such documents it is possible to characterize the management of a program or project and detect the areas of opportunity that exist. However, in general, the documentary information presents the “ought to be” of the management and processes of the programs, and therefore it is advisable to complement it with information on the “implementing reality”.

**b) Information obtained from surveys**

When the documentary information is not sufficient or it is desirable to complement it with information gathered from primary sources, ad hoc instruments should be developed to collect relevant information for the evaluation. For that purpose a tailored questionnaire can be designed based on the criteria, focus and scope of the evaluation that is defined. The confidence given by the hard data, however, should be weighed against the cost and time of doing a survey.
i) **Surveys of beneficiaries**

One form of obtaining information for the management evaluation is through the application of questionnaires. For example, to obtain information on the satisfaction of the beneficiaries of a program or project, a questionnaire is prepared in which, through instrumental questions, central topics are explored such as the quality and timeliness of the service, the quality and relevance of the goods and services provided by the program, the clarity in the information provided by the operators of the program or project, etc. This instrument makes it possible to obtain both quantitative and qualitative information for the construction of indicators.

ii) **Surveys of officers and other actors related to the program**

The officers and actors related to the implementation of the program or project are also an important source of information for the evaluation. Thus the preparation of questionnaires directed toward the actors that participate in the management of the program is an important methodological step in the information collection process. It is advisable to include questions directed to personnel on different levels of the program or project, since that provides information on the functionality of the lines of command and the clarity of the lines of action, both in regard to what is planned and to what in practice happens.

It is important to prepare the questionnaire to obtain quantitative information for the development of management indicators, such as operating costs, time passed between a request and its decision, disbursement of the budget, etc. It is also important to have in mind that the qualitative information that is collected through the interviews and surveys of officers of the program is based on opinions and perceptions, and therefore contains a significant margin of subjectivity and, possibly, bias. In order to reduce this subjectivity and obtain factual data, it is recommended to use as an additional instrument the compilation of verifiable information that is described below.

iii) **Compilation of verifiable information**

The purpose of this instrument is to collect hard data on the management of the program or project as verifiable information to complement or contrast to the qualitative information provided by the actors of the programs based on their perceptions. The instrument for compiling verifiable information is composed of fields that capture factual information related to the management of the project in order to verify that the processes are oriented toward achieving results. For example, from a sample of beneficiaries, data are recorded of the variables that define the target population in order to analyze if in fact the targeted population is being served. Other information that would be important to know is the times of delivery of the aid granted by the program, since the timeliness of such delivery can be critical for achieving the results.

Among the key topics that shape the instrument for compiling verifiable information are the criteria for the allocation of resources of the program or project. These criteria can refer to the variables in the characteristics of the target population (level of income, level of marginality, age group, etc.), the development priorities framing the program or project (national development plan, sectoral development plan, etc.), the priority production activity and priority link of the supply chain, etc. Other topics of interest related to the program are the publication of a call for beneficiaries, the date of opening of the applicant service windows, the dates of delivery of the program aid, the resources spent by the program and the information recorded in computerized systems that document the implementation.

c) **Guides for open interviews**

It is important to provide for the interviewing of key actors. For this it is suggested to develop interview guides for each topic of evaluation. Their objective is to direct the evaluator in the interviews done to capture the most relevant information related to the management of the program or project. The topics contemplated in the interview guides should keep a close relationship with the central topics of the evaluation, and therefore it is important to generate an interview guide for each type of actor involved in the implementation of the program or project, which will provide information from the different levels of responsibility and locate any areas of opportunity in the different processes.
1.4 Monitoring

The monitoring of a program or project provides qualitative and quantitative information through the measurement and timely reporting of the indicators contained in the Logical Framework (LF) of the program, so that the meeting of the targets leading to the achievement of the proposed outcomes and impacts can be evaluated and acted on.

According to the project cycle, the monitoring is done at intervals during the execution stage. In this regard, the monitoring, in contrast to the evaluation of outcomes and impact which measures the achievements of the program, makes it possible to know the progress towards the program targets at pre-established intervals. With monitoring, it is possible to answer, for each level of objectives of the LF, questions such as: Are the targets being met within the scheduled time period? What trend do the indicators show in relation to achieving outcomes and impact of the program? What areas of managing present opportunities for improvement in order to reverse deviations in reaching the targets? Thus, the purpose of monitoring a program or project is to measure and analyze its performance frequently in order to ensure that the managing of the program is rendering the expected results.

Given the above, on the one hand the Logical Framework of the program or project, which contains the objectives, the indicators and the targets of such program and, on the other hand, the baseline, which represents the base measurements of the performance indicators, constitute the essential starting points for monitoring the indicators of both management and results of a program or project. In that regard, the Logical Framework determines what the program or project should achieve starting from its implementation (Figure 5 and Table 7) in terms of both outcomes and impact (Purpose and Goal) and the program or project management (Outputs and Activities).

**FIGURE 5. DIAGRAM OF MONITORING THROUGH THE LF**

- Are the TARGETS being achieved in the programmed time period?
- Is it on track for achieving the expected outcomes and impacts?
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### TABLE 7. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE ELEMENTS OF THE LOGICAL FRAMEWORK AND MONITORING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element of the LF</th>
<th>Monitoring activity</th>
<th>Points to consider</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator of Purpose of the project</td>
<td>How much of the Purpose of the project has been achieved based on its progress?</td>
<td>When implementing the monitoring, it is necessary to clarify the medium-term achievements, as well as the global objective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outputs Indicators</td>
<td>Up to what point have the Outputs been achieved according to the progress of the project?</td>
<td>Idem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumptions and Risks</td>
<td>Are there changes in the external factors that affect the progress of the project?</td>
<td>The monitoring of external factors requires the assignment of roles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming</td>
<td>Are the Activities being performed in order to achieve the Outputs according to the plan?</td>
<td>Itemize the Activities and clarify the programming and the assignment of roles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outputs</td>
<td>Has the Activity produced the Outputs expected?</td>
<td>Need to clarify what is to be achieved (Outputs) through the Activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person in charge</td>
<td>In cases where there are problems in relation to the progress of the Activities and achievement of the Outputs, the method of feedback and decision making may require a clarification.</td>
<td>Need to clarify the assignment of roles and authority among the persons involved in the Activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The assumptions and risks are external factors that, as was mentioned in Module II, could make the execution of the next level in the narrative summary impossible. Therefore, when the assumptions and risks are monitored, risk management should be taken into account. When considering the handling of risk, special attention should be paid to the “important” assumptions, especially their “possibility of occurrence” and the “degree and type of impact”.
How to carry out the monitoring

In this part a set of methodological guidelines for the monitoring of public programs is presented, which correspond to:

- Definition of monitoring objectives
- Scope and timing of the monitoring
- Viability of the monitoring
- Steps to follow in the monitoring
- Report of results
- Sources of information.

a) Objectives of the monitoring

Before initiating the monitoring of a program or project it is necessary to be clear why it should be carried out, establishing the general objective and the specific objectives of the monitoring. For example, the general objective can be to give feedback on the program or project management through the timely measurement and reporting of the state of the indicators of the Logical Framework of such program or project so that the evaluations can be done and any corrective measures taken with respect to meeting the targets that will lead to the achievement of the expected outcomes and impact. The specific objectives can be referred to as: determining the progress in meeting the targets through the measurement of selected management and outcomes indicators, and the corresponding referencing of such indicators with those calculated with the baseline information.

b) Scope and timing of the monitoring

The performance of the programs is measured based on the indicators of the Logical Framework at the level of Goal, Purpose, Outcomes and Activities. The range of indicators includes, therefore, the following categories:

i) Impact indicators

Includes the indicators established for the Goal in the Logical Framework of the program or project.

ii) Outcomes indicators

Includes the indicators established for the Purpose specified in the Logical Framework of the program or project.

iii) Managing indicators

Includes the indicators specified for the Outputs and Activities in the Logical Framework of the program or project. These types of indicators refer, in general, to the delivery of goods and services, as well as to the disbursement of the financial resources of the program.

iv) Coverage indicators

Includes the coverage indicators of the program or project; that is to say, of the progress in the beneficiaries being served and the financial resources being disbursed. These indicators are useful for analyzing the feasibility of monitoring the impacts of a program or project.
Table 8 presents an example of the impact and outcome indicators to be monitored. Table 9 presents an example of management indicators.

**TABLE 8. EXAMPLE OF OUTCOME AND IMPACT INDICATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective level</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Frequency of measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Percentage of variation in the net increase of income of rural producers.</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Percentage of increase in the value of capital goods of the rural units of production.</td>
<td>Every six months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 9. EXAMPLE OF MANAGEMENT INDICATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective level</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Frequency of measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Output</td>
<td>Percentage of rural production units that have machinery and equipment for agricultural production.</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Percentage of agriculture mechanization projects approved.</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Percentage of livestock mechanization projects approved.</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) Viability of the monitoring

Before monitoring the outcomes and impact indicators, the feasibility of doing it should be evaluated; this consists of analyzing the program or project coverage of the target population. This is important because if the coverage is not significant, it cannot be expected to register changes in the values of the base indicators due to effects of the program. In this regard, the coverage of the program constitutes a necessary condition for being able to observe results. Thus, in order to consider the monitoring viable, it is suggested that it have at least 10% of coverage of the program or project with respect to the target population. The coverage analysis is done by obtaining the proportion represented by the cumulative number of beneficiaries from the initiation of operation of the program with respect to the size of the target population.
Another necessary condition, complementary to coverage, for the evaluation of the feasibility of the monitoring is the progress in spending. In other words, in addition to coverage, in order to be able to see the effects or results of a program, the program has to have delivered the products or services (aid) to the target population in question. In this regard, the degree of spending of the financial resources should also be evaluated. It is recommended to do the monitoring when the cumulative spending is at least 70% of what was budgeted.

d) Steps to follow in the monitoring

If the assessment of the feasibility of the monitoring is positive, then the steps described below of what is considered the “critical route” of monitoring should be taken into account.

i) Select and measure the key indicators

The monitoring should focus on those indicators that are a priority in terms of clarity, relevance and pertinence in order to know the progress of the program or project. An indicator is clear when it offers unequivocal information on the performance of a program, allowing the decision maker to have a clear idea about the direction of the program in achieving its objectives. For its part, the indicator is relevant when it presents key information on the development of the program and permits decision making. Finally, the indicator is pertinent when it effectively measures what the objectives of the program or project establish. In this way, decision makers can have succinct and substantial information on the performance of the program or project in question as of the date of the monitoring.

ii) Determine the meeting of targets

In order to determine whether targets have been met it is necessary to obtain the value of the indicators at the time of such determination and evaluate the progress, having as reference the base indicators. In this respect there can be several scenarios. Below two examples are presented.

Scenario 1: Deviation in meeting the target

In Table 10 two indicators are shown, one of which presents a deviation with respect to what was programmed, while the others are within an acceptable range.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective level</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Target in year T_{0+1}</th>
<th>Value of the target reached</th>
<th>Warning system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Output</td>
<td>Percentage of rural production units that have machinery and equipment for agricultural production.</td>
<td>30% as of 1st quarter</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Percentage of agriculture mechanization projects approved.</td>
<td>30% as of 1st quarter</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Percentage of livestock mechanization projects approved.</td>
<td>30% as of 1st quarter</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to the example presented in Table 10, it is irrelevant to do the monitoring for the Purpose indicator and, therefore for the Goal indicator, because the necessary conditions for observing changes in these indicators, which are the coverage and the delivery of goods and services, are not met since while the project approval process is in line with the established quarterly goal, the machinery and equipment have only been received by 5% of the production units for the same quarter. In other words, the deviation of the Outputs indicator implies that, at the time of monitoring, results would not be obtained at the level of Purpose (increase in the value of the capital goods of the production units) and Goal (increase in the net income of the rural producers).

**Scenario 2: Meeting targets**

In Table 11 an example is presented in which the indicators for measuring the proposed outcomes show significant progress in their fulfillment as scheduled. In these cases, the progress in meeting the targets indicates that the monitoring is feasible, since the values registered imply that it is possible there will be results at the Outputs, Purpose and Goal level, and therefore it is advisable to measure, through the indicators, the level of progress in the outcomes of the program or project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective level</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Target in the year $T_{0+1}$</th>
<th>Value of the target reached</th>
<th>Warning system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Output</td>
<td>Percentage of rural production units that have machinery and equipment for agricultural production.</td>
<td>30% accumulated as of 2nd semester</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Percentage of agriculture mechanization projects approved.</td>
<td>30% as of 1st quarter</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Percentage of livestock mechanization projects approved.</td>
<td>30% as of 1st quarter</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**e) Report of results**

The results of the measurement of the indicators are recorded in an information technology system which has been constructed in order to strengthen the use of monitoring results. It is desirable that such system include a warning system mechanism on the status that each indicator has.

Given the hierarchy of the objectives, it is also desirable that the monitoring system discriminate the information that it reports by level of responsibility of the user of the information. The director of the program or project, for example, will want to know how the indicators are performing on the entire narrative summary level, from the Activities to the Goal. However, a decision maker of a higher level would be interested only in the Purpose and Goal indicators, while for the program or project implementers responsible for delivering the goods and services that the program or project provides the relevant information is regarding the Activities indicators.

When the development of a system is not possible, a written report or executive summary should at least be generated, which presents to the decision makers the behavior of the indicators and, if applicable, the explanations of the causes and effects of the deviations in the targets. Below are some examples of cards that are useful for the indicators monitoring report (Tables 12, 13 and 14).
### TABLE 12. RESULTS OF THE MONITORING OF THE GOAL INDICATOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator (Goal)</th>
<th>Type of indicator</th>
<th>Meta para el año $T_{0+1}$</th>
<th>Targets for the year $T_{0+1}$</th>
<th>Warning system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of variation in the net increase of income of rural producers.</td>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>20% at first year of the program</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Obvious causes of the deviation:**
80% of the mechanization projects given aid were abandoned by the beneficiaries.

**Effects:**
The rural economic units given aid were not able to increase their productivity and income.

**Interpretation:**
- The high mortality of the projects has meant that the rural economic units do not increase the value of their assets, in spite of the efficiency in the delivery of aid.
- If such trend continues the achievement of the target to increase the income by 20% for the first year of the program is put at risk.

### TABLE 13. RESULTS OF MONITORING THE PURPOSE INDICATOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator (Goal)</th>
<th>Type of indicator</th>
<th>Meta para el año $T_{0+1}$</th>
<th>Targets for the year $T_{0+1}$</th>
<th>Warning system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of increase in the value of capital goods of the rural units of production.</td>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>80% at the second semester of the year $T_{0+1}$</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Obvious causes of the deviation:**
None.

**Effects:**
No obvious effects have been generated.

**Interpretation:**
- The aid has been granted in time and form, achieving administrative effectiveness but the expected result has not been generated. This is related to abandonment of the projects given aid.
- If this trend continues the achievement of the Purpose and the Goal is put at risk.
CUADRO 14. RESULTADOS DEL MONITOREO DEL INDICADOR DE COMPONENTE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator (output)</th>
<th>Target for the year $T_{0+1}$</th>
<th>Value year $T_{0+1}$</th>
<th>Warning system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of rural production units that have machinery and equipment for agricultural production.</td>
<td>30% accumulated at the 1st quarter</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Obvious causes of the deviation:**
Very broad definition of the target population.

**Effects:**
There would be an insignificant advance in the aid to the producers, maximun of 10% of the total objective population.

**Interpretation:**
- With the definition of the target population too broad, the coverage target is put at risk.
- If this trend continues it would only come to cover a maximum of 10% of the target population, which would directly affect the achievement of the expected outcomes and impacts in spite of meeting the targets of the Activities.

f) Sources of information

The sources of basic information for the monitoring of the programs include the following, among others:

i) **Documentary information**

The minimum documentary information required to carry out the monitoring includes the following:

- Logical Framework of the program or project (contains the specification of the indicators and their frequency of measurement).
- Information on coverage progress of the program or project.
- Any other type of documentary information that contains data for the calculation of indicators and determination of targets, such as decisions on applications, delivery-reception of program or project aid certificates, etc.

ii) **Field information**

This information comes from the application of field surveys to obtain data for the calculation of the indicators to be monitored.

In general there is a broad spectrum of information collection methods, both formal and informal, which are commonly used for the monitoring of programs. Figure 6 presents a spectrum of instruments for the collection of information, depending on the formality required in this respect.
IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING

FIGURE 6. SPECTRUM OF METHODS FOR COLLECTING INFORMATION

Source: Adapted from Morra and Rist (2009).
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1.5 Intermediate performance evaluation

Monitoring provides hard data on the performance of the indicators in a program or project. However, the mere knowledge of the value of the indicator and its relationship with the targets for such indicator in a particular moment is not sufficient to issue assessments on the performance of the program or project during its implementation. Therefore, it is of interest to complement the monitoring with an intermediate performance evaluation such that, on the one hand, the monitoring tells us what and how much and, on the other hand, the intermediate performance evaluation tells us why. In this regard, the intermediate performance evaluation makes it possible to answer questions such as: Are the results being achieved in the scheduled time period? What are the reasons or factors that determine the degree observed in the meeting of targets? What areas of management present opportunities for improvement in order to reverse deviations in the strategic indicators? Can it be concluded that the program or project is on the correct route for achieving its outcomes and impacts; that is, if the current rhythm of meeting the target continues, can it be expected that the program will achieve the objectives for which it was designed and implemented?

a) Objective of the evaluation

The objective of the intermediate performance evaluation is to provide feedback on the management of a program or project through the assessment of the achievement of its targets, of both results and management (Figure 7), so that recommendations may be issued, when appropriate, for the implementation of corrective measures that reverse any deviations that exist in meeting the targets in order to ensure the achievement of the objectives of the program. The intermediate performance evaluation is oriented, then, toward providing decision makers with information on the progress in reaching, through its implementation, the targets established for the project or program and if they are conducive to achieving the expected outcomes and impacts.

**FIGURE 7. ROUTE OF INTERMEDIATE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION**

- **Current situation**
  - If there is no progress in Managing

- **Desired transformation**
  - The outcomes and impacts are not achieved

**Activities**
- Operating process (Opening of application office, rating of projects, etc.)
- Disbursement of budget resources in time and form
- Quality processes
- Follow up on the aid

**Outputs**
- (Goods and Services)
  - Delivery of aid: Subsidies
  - Delivery of services: Technical assistance
  - Coverage of the target population

**Purpose**
- (Outcomes)
  - Capitalization
  - Greater productivity

**Goal**
- (Impacts)
  - Greater income

Given that the intermediate performance evaluation provides information for decision making for the purpose of introducing corrective measures when there is a failure to meet the targets of the program or project, the assessment that is done should show why the target has been achieved to that degree as well as the progress in achieving the results. Such explanation should, therefore, identify the factors that determine the level of performance found of the program or project up to the time of doing the monitoring. It is also important that the evaluation present in a timely manner the information resulting from it, so that corrective measures can be taken that lead decision makers to ensure the achievement of the objectives proposed by the program or project.

b) Scope of evaluation

i) Management

In terms of management, the effectiveness and quality in the delivery of the goods and services that the program or project provides is evaluated, as well as the efficiency in the spending of the resources. In this regard, through the evaluation it should be possible to answer questions such as: what is the degree of achievement of the targets established in the LF of the program or project with respect to providing the Outputs to the beneficiaries of the program or project?

In addition, as already mentioned, a necessary condition for the program or project to achieve its objectives consists of reaching the population that has the development problem addressed by the program. In that regard, the following evaluation questions could be appropriate:

- To what extent is the program or project covering (addressing with goods and services) the population that it is intended to serve (target population)?
- Does the coverage observed of the target population make it possible to reach the target established in the LF for the period corresponding to the monitoring?
- Does the coverage of the target population observed make it possible to predict that all the target population will be covered at the end of the program or project?
- In what zones of the country was the attention of the program or project concentrated?
- In what strata of the target population was the attention of the program or project concentrated?
- Is there a correlation between the attended population and the strata of target population considered a priority in the managing of the program or project?

Management best practices for a program or project also include, among other things, the use of evaluations and, of course, of the recommendations derived from them to support decision making in the program or project. In this regard, if design and/or functioning and implementation evaluations have been done of a program or project, it is important to assess which of the recommendations made from these evaluations have been implemented and for any recommendations that have not been implemented, what factors determined this. It is possible that some of the recommendations of these evaluations are not pertinent or of use, and in this regard it should be analyzed which aspects from prior evaluations and which aspects of the current one should be taken into account in the short term to ensure the achievement of the outcomes and impacts of the program or project.

ii) Results

The targets set up in the LF of the program or project establish the intermediate results that should be reached, both regarding outcomes and impact, during its implementation. The reaching of such targets accounts for the progress
toward the solution of the problem addressed by such program (design and implementation). In that sense, as part of the intermediate performance evaluation, it is relevant to be able to answer evaluation questions that are related to the degree of achievement of the targets of the indicators defined in the LF of the program or project at the level of Purpose and Goal.

**iii) Follow up on the goods and services provided**

Given that the optimum use of the goods and services provided by the program or project is of vital importance for achieving the expected results, following up on the aid makes it possible to enrich the intermediate performance evaluation given that it contributes information on the permanence of the goods provided to the beneficiaries and/or the effectiveness in their use. In this respect, some of the basic questions that should be answered through the area of the evaluation are the following:

- Do the beneficiaries keep the goods provided by the program or project?
- What is the rate of survival of the goods provided?
- What is the degree of use or underuse of the goods and services provided by the program or project?
- What is the cause of the non-use or underuse of the goods and services by the beneficiaries if that is the case?

For following up on the goods and services provided by the program or project, field information is required. Tool 1 presents the methodology for carrying out mini-surveys for this purpose.

c) Sources of information

The sources of basic information for the intermediate performance evaluation include, among others, the following:

- LF of the program or project, since it contains the performance indicators.
- Results of the monitoring of the program or project with the information on meeting targets.
- Data on coverage of the program or project.
- Financial information, regarding both what was budgeted and what has been spent.
- Results and recommendations of prior evaluations of the program or project, in particular those corresponding to design, and functioning and implementation, when they have been carried out.
- Information resulting from interviews of implementers of the program or project, as well as other actors linked to its management, in order to know their perceptions and perspectives.
- Information from field research that has been done for such purpose in order to verify the use of the goods and services granted by the program, and from surveys of beneficiaries on the quality of the program or project services.

Finally, with regard to the information on the quality of the program or project services, it is useful to have information through which questions such as the following can be answered:

- How is the treatment received by the beneficiary throughout the process of requesting aid evaluated?
- According to the needs of the beneficiaries, was the time between the request and the delivery of the support reasonable?
• What percentage of beneficiaries is satisfied with the service given by the area responsible for the program or project?

• What is the cost/benefit ratio of processing of the aid from the point of view of the beneficiaries?

• Does the aid received satisfy the specifications of the real needs felt by the beneficiaries?

FOR MORE INFORMATION:
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Summmary

The execution is the stage in which the program or project formulated in the prior stages of diagnosis and design is put in motion. In other words, the Activities are carried out that lead to achieving the Outputs that, in turn, lead to fulfillment of the Purpose in the established time period.

The primary actions that should be taken in this stage are the budgeting and the establishment of rules of operation that regulate the running of the project. The budgeting is the assignment of the monetary resources that make it possible to carry out the Activities, and it must be done consistently with achieving the expected results (following the results-based management approach), and not through the allocation of resources based on conventional practices. The rules of operation, for their part, specify the form of implementing the program or project, which makes it possible to efficiently apply the allocated resources.

In order to reduce the difference between what is planned and what is implemented, it is necessary to carry out monitoring and evaluation activities. During the execution, two types of evaluation are done, one for design and one for processes. The design evaluation analyzes the coherence between the parts that make up the program or project, ensuring the vertical and horizontal logic of the Logical Framework. For its part, the processes evaluation analyzes the implementation of the project. The purpose of both evaluations is to identify areas of opportunity, either in the design or in the implementation in order to issue recommendations on pertinent changes that will lead to achieving the Purpose of the program or project. In this same context, monitoring is a continuous verification of the progress of a program or project during its implementation and the information arising from the monitoring is an important input for the evaluation.
IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING
Results Based Public Management
TOOLS FOR THE DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION OF PUBLIC RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS WITH A PROJECT CYCLE APPROACH
Tools
TOOL 1

Case study: Terms of reference for the evaluation of the design of a program

This case study uses information from the experience and tools developed by the FAO Policy Evaluation and Analysis Project in the framework of the technical assistance agreement with the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, Rural Development, Fish and Food (SAGARPA) of Mexico.

Below are the terms of reference for the design evaluation of the Program for the Funding of Capital Goods for Agricultural Production. The terms of reference were based on the general guidelines issued by the National Social Development Policy Evaluation Council (CONEVAL) for the evaluation of federal programs in Mexico. Given that this chapter is not intended to show how the terms of reference were drafted, the sections of this chapter only present the objectives of the evaluation, the methodological approach and the specific evaluation questions, which are grouped in turn into the following evaluation topics: i) Identification of the development problem the Program addresses, ii) Contribution of the Program to higher strategic objectives, iii) Analysis of the internal logic of the Logical Framework, iv) Definition and quantification of the potential and target population, v) Correlation between the Program design and its rules of operation, and vi) Relationship of the Program with other programs that converge on addressing the agriculture sector.

1.1 General evaluation objective

The general objective of the evaluation of the Program is to contribute proposals for improving the design of the Program for the Funding of Capital Goods for Agricultural Production through the analysis of its internal consistency, in order to make this a more efficient and effective public policy instrument in addressing the problem to which it is directed.

1.1.1 Specific objectives

The specific objectives of the evaluation of the Program are:

a) Definition of the assessed development problem in order to have elements that improve its enunciation and strengthen the justification of the Program that addresses it.

b) Contribution of the Program to the higher development objectives analyzed in order to determine the degree of its alignment with the sectoral and national level objectives.

c) Logical Framework of the Program evaluated in relation to the formulation of the objectives and the validation of its internal logic in its vertical and horizontal dimensions.

d) Definition of the potential and target population of the Program analyzed and, if applicable, proposals oriented toward improving their delimitation.

e) Correlation between the design and the regulation of the evaluated Program and, if applicable, recommendations for improvement that contribute to achieving the expected results.

f) Relationship of the Program with other assessed programs in order to have proposals oriented toward strengthening their coordination.

8 For abbreviation purposes, in this section the Program for the Funding of Capital Goods for Agricultural Production is referred to as the Program.
1.2 Methodological approach

The general approach of the evaluation is defined by the following fundamental elements:

1.2.1 Analysis with public policy vision, which assesses to what extent the Program possesses a focus on results

This element of the approach refers to focusing the evaluation on assessing if in the design of the Program for the Funding of Capital Goods for Agricultural Production, objectives, indicators and targets are contemplated that make it possible to measure the quality of spending and the degree to which the expected outcomes and impacts are reached.

In this manner, the evaluation will analyze the Logical Framework (LF) of the Program prepared by the Ministry of Agriculture, which summarizes the essential design elements. Thus, the evaluation will focus on verifying that the internal logic of the LF is followed through an analysis of the formulation of the objectives, and of the vertical and horizontal logic.

1.2.2 Analytical nature of the evaluation

The evaluation will be analytical, which means that each aspect of the design that is addressed is analyzed rigorously in order to obtain robust information that supports proposals for improvements.

1.2.3 Timeliness of the results of the evaluation

The timeliness of the results is of fundamental importance, since the timely presentation of the products of the evaluation will make it possible for the Ministry of Agriculture to use them to full advantage. In relation to this aspect, the evaluation will contribute proposals to improve the design and adjust the regulation of the Program.

1.2.4 Practical nature of the recommendations

The evaluation will generate elements of information and analysis that provide feedback for the decision making of the officers in charge of the Program. For such purpose, the recommendations contained in the evaluation report will be relevant, concrete and feasible to implement; furthermore, the recommendations will clearly indicate the what, the how and the why of the proposed changes.

1.3 Evaluation topics and questions

The evaluation of the Program will focus on analyzing the internal consistency of its design and identifying possible areas of improvement, in order to formulate recommendations that would strengthen such Program and make it a more effective public intervention instrument in promoting development in the rural sector. In this regard, the evaluation will cover the following evaluation topics:

1. Identification of the development problem that the Program addresses.
2. Contribution of the Program to higher strategic objectives.
3. Analysis of the internal logic of the Logical Framework of the Program:

   a) Narrative summary
   b) Vertical logic
   c) Horizontal logic
   d) Assumptions and risks

4. Definition and quantification of the potential and target population.

5. Correlation between the design of the Program and the rules of operation.

6. Relationship of the Program with other programs that converge in addressing the agriculture sector.

The next sections set forth the purpose of each of these evaluation topics and a set of key questions are presented to guide the evaluation process.

The questions presented in each evaluation topic should be answered with solid argumentation, presenting the documentary evidence and analysis that supports the respective response. In addition, each question should be answered in a binary form (Yes or No), except for those that are marked with an asterisk and that are formulated to be answered openly. The affirmative or negative answer will depend on the evidentiary support that is presented.

At the end of the terms of reference a series of notes is presented that expand the definition of certain terms and phrases indicated in the evaluation questions.

1.3.1 Identification of the development problem that the Program addresses

This evaluation topic concerns the identification and definition of the problem that it is sought to address through the execution of the Program, and whether for that purpose some study or diagnosis has been used that identifies the cause and effect relationships of the problem in question.

In order to develop the analysis of this topic the following questions will be considered:

1. Is the problem to which the Program is directed correctly identified?\(^9\)?

2. Is the problem to which the Program is directed clearly defined?\(^10\)?

3. Is the problem it is intended to solve relevant? That is, is it important enough to justify the existence of the Program?

1.3.2 Contribution of the Program to the higher strategic objectives

This topic analyzes to what extent the objectives of the evaluated Program contribute to achieving the strategic objectives established by the Ministry of Agriculture and the objectives of the National Development Plan.

The evaluation of this topic will consider the following basic questions:

---

9 The problem to which the Program is directed is correctly identified when the causes or factors that originate it are indicated and also the effects that such problem generates are clearly established.

10 The problem to which the Program is directed is clearly defined when it is drafted clearly and concisely.
4. To which national objective or objectives of the National Development Plan are the strategic objectives of the Ministry of Agriculture linked?*

5. To which strategic objective or objectives of the Ministry of Agriculture do the objectives of the Program contribute?*

1.3.3 Analysis of the internal logic of the Logical Framework of the Program

The purpose of analyzing the internal logic is to verify that the Logical Framework is correctly structured and that it presents, in an orderly and summarized manner, the primary elements of the design. For that, it should be analyzed if the objectives of the Program are formulated clearly and if the internal logic of the LF is followed in its vertical and horizontal dimensions.

The evaluation of the vertical logic of the Logical Framework consists of assessing if at each objectives level of the narrative summary (Activities, Outputs, Purpose and Goal) the necessary and sufficient conditions are satisfied to achieve the objective of the next higher level.

The analysis of the horizontal logic, for its part, consists of evaluating if the indicators established are appropriate for measuring the achievement of the objectives of the Program, and if the necessary and sufficient means of verification have been identified in order to obtain the data required for calculating such indicators.

Furthermore, as part of this topic, an analysis will be done of the assumptions and risks included in the LF to assess their formulation and the impact of their occurrence on achieving the objectives.

To develop the analysis in this section, the evaluation questions presented below will be answered.

a) Narrative summary

6. In defining the Goal of the Program, are the what, the means, and the how it contributes to achieving the higher objective established clearly indicated?

7. Is the statement of the Purpose formulated so that it is clear that there is just one objective of the Program at this level?

8. Does the objective of the Program, at the Purpose level, correspond to the solution of the central problem identified?11

9. In the definition of the Purpose is reference made to the target population that it is sought to serve through the Program?

10. Is the Purpose of the Program formulated as a state already achieved?

11. Are the Outputs stated so that they indicate with precision the type of finished products or services provided by the Program?

12. Are the Outputs of the Program expressed in terms of a situation already reached?

13. Are the Activities clearly defined and do they contain sufficient information on the tasks or actions that the Program develops?

---

11 The objective of the Program, at the Purpose level, corresponds to the solution of the problem identified if it constitutes a clear description regarding the future situation that would be reached when the central problem indicated in the problem tree is solved.
b) Vertical logic of the narrative summary

14. Are the Activities included in the Logical Framework necessary\(^{12}\), in quantitative and qualitative terms, to generate the Outputs of the Program?

15. Is the set of Activities contemplated in the Logical Framework sufficient\(^{13}\), in quantitative and qualitative terms, to produce each of the Outputs?

16. Are the Outputs defined in the Logical Framework necessary\(^{14}\), in quantitative and qualitative terms, to achieve the Purpose?

17. Are the set of Outputs defined in the Logical Framework sufficient\(^{15}\), in quantitative and qualitative terms, to achieve the Purpose?

18. Is it clear and logical that achieving the Purpose of the Program contributes to achieving the Goal?

19. Considering the analysis done in this section, is the vertical logic of the Logical Framework of the Program validated? If it is not, provide and justify the changes that should be made in the LF to ensure its vertical logic.

\(^{12}\) It is considered that the Activities are necessary to produce each of the Outputs if there is no activity that is redundant; in other words, if carrying out each of them represents a contribution in the generation of one of the Outputs.

\(^{13}\) It is considered that the set of Activities are sufficient if no activity relevant for producing the Outputs is missing from the Logical Framework.

\(^{14}\) It is considered that the Outputs are necessary for the achievement of the Purpose if there is no Output that is redundant; that is, if the generation of each of them contributes to reaching the Purpose.

\(^{15}\) It is considered that the Outputs are sufficient if there is no additional Output that is relevant for achieving the Purpose missing from the Logical Framework.

\(^{16}\) The indicators corresponding to the Goal are pertinent when they are expressed using variables that objectively measure to what degree the Program contributes to achieving the higher level objective established.

\(^{17}\) It is considered that the means of verification are pertinent when they constitute sources of information that provide the data necessary and sufficient to calculate the corresponding indicator. The means of verification are considered reliable if they provide precise information that can be confirmed. In addition, the means of verification are cost effective if they provide the required information at a reasonable cost.

\(^{18}\) The indicators defined for the Purpose are pertinent if they are stated through variables that make it possible to objectively measure the degree to which the Program is able to generate the direct outcomes and impacts of its execution.

c) Horizontal logic of the four levels of the narrative summary

i) Goal

20. Does the Program have pertinent indicators\(^{16}\) to measure the achievement of its objective at the Goal level?

21. Do the indicators set up to measure the achievement of the Goal establish specific targets and deadlines?

22. To measure the achievement of the Goal, has the Program identified pertinent, reliable and cost effective means of verification\(^{17}\)?

23. Does the Program contemplate the conducting of a baseline study for Goal indicators?

ii) Purpose

24. At the Purpose level, does the Program have the pertinent indicators\(^{18}\) to measure the fulfillment of the objective established?

25. Do the indicators established for measuring the progress of the Purpose contemplate specific targets and deadlines?

26. In order to calculate the indicators of the Purpose, has the Program identified pertinent, reliable and cost effective means of verification?

27. Has the Program established a baseline for the Purpose indicators?
iii) Outputs

28. Does the Program have the pertinent indicators\(^{19}\) to measure the fulfillment of its objectives at the Output level?

29. Do the indicators established for determining to what extent the Program is able to produce its Outputs contemplate specific targets and deadlines?

30. In order to obtain the data that make it possible to calculate the indicators of the Outputs, has the Program identified pertinent, reliable and cost effective means of verification?

31. In those cases in which indicators are established for measuring the effects of the Program at the Outputs level, has a baseline been established from which to measure the impacts?

iv) Activities

32. Does the Program have the pertinent indicators\(^{20}\) to measure the progress in carrying out its Activities?

33. Has the Program defined specific targets and deadlines for the indicators corresponding to Activities?

34. Are the pertinent, reliable and cost effective means of verification identified for calculating the Activities indicators?

35. Considering the analysis done in this section, is the horizontal logic of the Logical framework entirely validated? If it is not, propose and justify the changes that should be made to the Logical framework in order to ensure its horizontal logic.

d) Assumptions and risks of the four levels of the narrative summary

i) Activities

36. Are the assumptions and risks established for the Activity level relevant\(^{21}\); that is, do they correspond to intrinsic situations or events that condition the achievement of the next level of objectives?

37. Do the risks incorporated as assumptions for the Activities have a source external to the program that escapes the control of its management?

38. Are the assumptions established pertinent\(^{22}\) in terms of the probability of the risk referred to occurring?

39. Are the assumptions formulated positively; that is, as conditions that must be met?

ii) Outputs

40. Are the assumptions established for the Output level relevant\(^{23}\); that is, do they correspond to situations or events that condition the achievement of the next level of objectives?

---

19 The indicators corresponding to the Outputs are pertinent if they are defined through variables that objectively measure to what degree the Program is able to produce the goods and services it has envisaged to generate.

20 The indicators defined for the Activities level are pertinent when they are stated through variables that make it possible to objectively measure the progress of the actions that the Program carries out.

21 The assumptions established for the Activities level are relevant if they indicate conditions inherent to them. Furthermore, the assumptions must be met in order to be able to carry out the actions of the Program as set forth in the design.

22 An assumption is pertinent if there is a reasonable probability that the external risk referred to will occur, so that it merits being considered. In this regard, if the occurrence of the risk were improbable there would be no reason to include the assumption, and if it were too high then it would be a fatal assumption that would require the redesign of the Program.

23 The assumptions formulated for the Output level are relevant if they refer to conditions inherent to them and, therefore, they must be met in order for the goods and services of the Program to be provided as set forth in its design, once the Activities have been carried out.
41. Do the risks incorporated as assumptions for the Outputs have a source external to the Program that escapes the control of its management?

42. Are the assumptions established pertinent in terms of the probability of the risk referred to occurring?

43. Are the assumptions formulated positively; that is, as conditions that must be met?

iii) Purpose

44. Are the assumptions established for the Purpose level relevant\(^{24}\); that is, do they correspond to intrinsic situations or events that condition the achievement of the next level of objective?

45. Do the risks incorporated as assumptions for the Purpose have a source external to the Program that escapes the control of its management?

46. Are the assumptions established pertinent in terms of the probability of occurrence of the risk referred to?

47. Are the assumptions formulated positively; that is, as conditions that must be met?

iv) Goal

48. Are the assumptions established for the Goal level relevant\(^{25}\); that is, do they correspond to intrinsic situations or events that condition the sustainability of the benefits generated by the Program?

49. Do the risks incorporated as assumptions for the Goal have a source external to the Program that escapes the control of its management?

50. Are the assumptions established pertinent in terms of the probability of occurrence of the risk referred to?

51. Are the assumptions formulated positively; that is, as conditions that must be met?

1.3.4 Definition and quantification of the potential and target population

The purpose of the evaluation of this topic is to determine if the Program has defined and quantified the potential population and the target population to which it is directed, which will reveal if it focuses its actions on the population it considers a priority to serve.

The potential population is composed of all those producers or rural production units that present the problem that the Program proposes to resolve.

The target population, for its part, is a subgroup of the potential population\(^{26}\), and it is made up of those producers that the Program has defined as a priority and plans to assist in a specified time period.

In order to analyze this topic the following questions will be answered:

52. Does the Program have a definition of its potential population based on clear technical criteria\(^ {27}\)?

---

\(^{24}\) The assumptions established for the Purpose are relevant if they indicate conditions that are inherent to it and, therefore, have to be satisfied for the Program to achieve this objective; that is, the assumptions are pertinent when they are related to external events whose presence affects the magnitude of the direct results that the Program seeks.

\(^{25}\) The assumptions established for the Goal level are relevant if they constitute a hypothesis referring to necessary conditions for the Program to effectively achieve its contribution to fulfilling the higher objective considered.

\(^{26}\) According to this definition, in some cases the target population may correspond to the entire potential population.

\(^{27}\) In order to answer this question it will be assessed whether in the design of the Program the potential population is defined using explicit technical, economic and/or social variables that ensure that such Program is directed toward those producers that face the identified development problem.
53. Is the population defined as the potential population the correct one; that is, does it correspond to the population that presents the problem that the Program intends to solve?

54. Has the Program quantified its potential population considering the technical criteria that were used in its definition?

55. Has the Program defined its target population based on clear technical criteria\(^{28}\)?

56. Is the population defined as the target population the correct one; that is, does it correspond to the population to which the Program should be directed in order to achieve its objectives?

57. Has the Program quantified its target population considering the technical criteria used in its definition?

1.3.5 Correlation between the design of the Program and the rules of operation

The purpose of the evaluation of this topic is to analyze if the rules of operation of the Program constitute a regulatory instrument that will ensure that the key elements of its design are implemented in a manner that achieves the objectives efficiently and effectively.

In order to focus the analysis of this section the following evaluation questions will be considered:

58. Do the rules of operation establish the pertinent procedures and mechanisms\(^{29}\) that ensure the Activities contemplated in the design of the Program are carried out so that its objectives are achieved?

59. Do the selection procedures established in the rules of operation to determine the type of beneficiaries and/or investment projects that will be given aid guarantee that the Program really serves its target population and reaches its objectives?

60. Do the rules of operation of the program contain regulatory elements that establish, as part of the operation, the follow up on the aid granted in order to ensure that its use results in the achievement of the objectives?

61. Do the rules of operation contain regulatory elements that ensure the monitoring and evaluation of the progress and achievement of the objectives of the Program?

1.3.6 Relationship of the Program with other programs

The evaluation of this topic seeks to assess the linkage of the Program for the Funding of Capital Goods for Agricultural Production with other public programs directed toward rural development executed by the Ministry of Agriculture and other governmental agencies related to the agricultural sector, with the purpose of determining if there are relationships of complementarity, duplication, counteraction and/or competition among them. In relation to this topic, the following questions should be answered:

62. Considering the design of the Program evaluated, with which programs of the public administration and with what elements of their design is there complementarity and/or synergy?\(^{*}\)

---

\(^{28}\) In order to answer this question it will be analyzed if the Program has used technical, economic and/or social variables that actually make it possible to delimitate that part of the potential population that is considered a priority to assist in the short and medium term, so that the objectives established are achieved and the impacts of the subsidies are maximized.

\(^{29}\) To answer this question it will be assessed if in the rules of operation certain mechanisms are defined whose function is to guarantee that the agency in charge of the Program develops all the Activities contained in the design in order to reach the expected outcomes. In this regard, it will be analyzed to what extent compliance with the rules of the Program guarantees that the central elements of its design are fully implemented, so that all the actions carried out contribute to achieving the objectives.
63. Considering the design of the Program evaluated, with which programs of the public administration and with what elements of their design is there duplication?*

64. Considering the design of the Program evaluated, with which programs of the public administration and with what elements of their design is there counteraction?*

65. Considering the design of the Program evaluated, with which programs of the public administration and with what elements of their design is there competition?*

1.4 Sources of information

Below the primary sources of information that should be consulted at a minimum for the evaluation of the design of the Program are indicated.

1.4.1 Documentary information

a) Sectoral policy documents
   - National Development Plan
   - Sectoral Program of the Ministry of Agriculture

b) Regulatory documents
   - Rural development law of the country
   - Rules of operation of the Program
   - Technical annex of the execution of the Program
   - General guidelines for the evaluation of programs of the public administration
   - National government expenditures budget decree

c) Program design documents
   - Logical Framework of the Program for the Funding of Capital Goods for Agricultural Production
   - Program problem tree
   - Program objectives tree
   - Program alternatives tree

---

30 It is considered that there is counteraction between two or more public programs where the goods and/or services they deliver to the same target population have contrary effects or generate opposing incentives.

31 It is considered that there is a relationship of competition between two or more public programs that serve the same target population when they deliver the same type of aid establishing different conditions to the beneficiaries receiving the aid. These conditions can differ in relation to the degree of flexibility of the requirements for access to the program, the percentage of the funding and/or the maximum amount of aid for the projects.
1.4.2 Interviews of officers and other actors related to the Program

To complement the information collected through documentary sources, interviews and work meetings will be held with the responsible officers of the Program and other actors related to it. For such purpose, the evaluation team will prepare a questionnaire and/or interview guide in order to obtain relevant information for the evaluation of the Program.
Case study: Terms of reference for the evaluation of the functioning and implementation of a program

The case study presented here is the result of the experience and tools developed by the FAO Evaluation and Analysis of Rural Policies Project in the framework of the technical assistance agreement with the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, Rural Development, Fishing and Food (SAGARPA) of Mexico.

In this chapter the terms of reference are presented for the evaluation of the functioning and implementation of the Program for the funding of capital Goods for Agricultural Production. The terms of reference were based on the general guidelines issued by the National Social Development Policy Evaluation Council (CONEVAL) for the evaluation of federal programs in Mexico. The sections of this chapter present the objectives of the evaluation, the methodological approach and the specific evaluation questions, which are grouped in relation to the following evaluation topics: i) Institutional setting for implementing the Program, ii) Budgeting process of the Program, iii) Planning of the implementation of the Program, iv) Coordination of the implementation of the Program with other federal programs, v) Service to the target population, vi) Decisions on applications and projects, vii) Allocation of the resources of the Program, viii) Fulfillment of the implementation process, ix) Follow up on the aid, x) Monitoring of the management of the Program, xi) Systemization of the information generated by the Program, xii) Transparency and accountability, xiii) Quality in the service, xiv) Incorporation of improvements in the management of the Program, xv) Global assessment of the functioning and operation of the Program.

2.1 General objective of the evaluation

2.1.1 General objective

The general objective of the evaluation of the Program is to contribute proposals to improve the functioning and the implementation of the Program for the Funding of Capital Goods for Agricultural Production through the analysis of the main processes of its execution, in order to make it a more efficient and effective public policy instrument for addressing the problem in question.

2.1.2 Specific objectives

The evaluation of the Program has the following specific objectives:

a) Institutional setting analyzed in terms of its functionality and pertinence for the implementation of the Program.

b) Planning processes, allocation of resources and follow up on the aid evaluated and given feedback through proposals to elevate the efficiency and effectiveness of the management of the Program.

c) Targeting and coverage of the target population of the program analyzed and, if applicable, proposals made for ensuring that the resources granted actually reach the intended producers.

d) Availability and use of information systems of the Program evaluated in order to have possible improvements that contribute to the monitoring of the Program’s management.

For purposes of abbreviation, in this section the Program for the Funding of Capital Goods for Agricultural Production will be referred to as the Program.
2.2 Methodological approach

The general focus of the evaluation is defined by the following fundamental elements:

2.2.1 Directing the Program toward results

This aspect of the approach refers to directing the evaluation toward determining if the Program for the Funding of Capital Goods for Agricultural Production is supported by results-based planning and management. This involves assessing if the implementation of the Program is efficient and effective, and if it is conducive to achieving the expected results. In other words, it is sought to determine if the different stages of the decision-making chain, which go from the dissemination of the Program to the delivery and follow up on the aid, are developed consistently with the achievement of the established objectives.

In order to evaluate the functioning and implementation of the Program, visits will be made to a sample of states to do field work that will provide direct information on the execution processes.

2.2.2 Analytical nature of the evaluation

The content of the evaluation will be eminently analytical. In this regard the analysis will seek to identify the factors and ultimate causes that explain the processes and phenomena observed in relation to each of the evaluation topics. This means that each topic addressed will be analyzed rigorously in order to obtain robust information that supports the proposals made for improvement.

2.2.3 Timeliness of the results of the evaluation

The timeliness of the results is of fundamental importance, since the timely presentation of the evaluation products will allow the Ministry of Agriculture to make full use of them. In relation to this aspect, the evaluation will contribute proposals for improving management and adjusting the regulation of the Program.

2.2.4 Practical nature of the recommendations

The evaluation will generate information and analysis that provides feedback on the decision making of the officers responsible for the Program. For such purpose, the recommendations contained in the evaluation report will be relevant, specific and feasible to implement; the recommendations will also clearly indicate the what, the how and the why of the proposed changes.

2.3 Evaluation topics

The purpose of the evaluation of the functioning and implementation of the Program is to provide feedback on its execution in order to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the different stages of its decision-making chain. For this, the evaluation seeks to determine if the Program is being implemented in a manner that will lead to achieving the expected results, and attempts to identify areas for improvement in this execution process.

Below the topics are presented that will be addressed in the evaluation and for each of them a set of evaluation questions will be established that constitute a minimum basis for guiding the development of the analysis.
2.3.1 Institutional setting for implementing the Program

The agencies indicated in the Program’s regulations will be assessed in relation to their assigned tasks, responsibilities and functions; and it will be determined if, in practice, they assume their functions and responsibilities as established in the rules of operation.

1. Was the design and implementation of the Program for the Funding of Capital Goods for Agricultural Production accompanied by a process of restructuring the responsible agencies and units inside the Ministry of Agriculture in order to ensure that their functioning responds to the logic and objectives of the new Program?

2. To what extent do the functions of the different executive bodies and agencies of the Program defined in the Internal Regulations of the Ministry continue to be pertinent and consistent with the Activities of the new Program?

3. Is there within the Ministry of Agriculture and the executing agencies a Responsible Unit, formally designated, that conducts the Program in coordination with the different technical areas involved and that is responsible for achieving the objectives and results of the Program?

4. In the applicable regulations are the minimum necessary elements established on the responsibilities and functions of each of the decision-making bodies that intervene in the implementation of the Program so that their functioning leads to achieving the expected results?

5. Do the agencies that participate in the operation of the Program in the states/provinces/regions have the necessary institutional capacity, in terms of material and human resources, for the efficient and effective implementation of the Program?

6. To what extent do the offices of the Ministry of Agriculture in the states/provinces/regions function as interlocutors for the Ministry with the State/Province/Regional Governments in order to define the investment priorities and consequent distribution of the resources of the Program?

2.3.2 Program budgeting process

The manner in which the budgeting process of the Program is carried out and its results-based approach will be analyzed. The purpose is to determine if the process of programming the funds of the Program, in which different institutional actors are involved, is done addressing the identified problem.

7. During the budgeting process of the Program, are the definitions adopted by the various participating agencies (Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Finance, Congress) aligned in the sense that they all respond to the logic of the same expected results?

8. Based on what type of technical criteria and considerations does the Congress do the budgeting of the Program in the national budget and to what extent are these criteria pertinent in addressing the rural development priorities?

2.3.3 Planning of the implementation of the Program

This topic assesses if the Program has developed and utilized some type of planning system for its execution, and if it is focused on results. In particular, any work plans are reviewed for relevance assessing if they contain clear strategies that guide the management of the Program toward achieving its objectives.
9. Does the Program have and use any work plan that contains the strategies and instruments adequate to guide its management toward achieving results?

10. Are the resources of the Program distributed based on previously established objectives and targets?

11. Does the Program have any procedures manual, operating guide and/or implementation guidelines that adequately guide its execution?

12. Were participatory processes for planning the Program carried out, both centrally and in the local government sphere?

2.3.4 Coordination of the implementation of the Program with other federal programs

It will be analyzed whether the Program is executed in coordination with other public programs, of both the Ministry of Agriculture and other agencies of the government. This will involve investigating to what extent those responsible for the execution of the Program are supported by any strategy for coordinating actions with the implementers of other programs in order to ensure linkage and complementarity among the different instruments of the national rural public policy.

13. Are the Activities of the Program for the Funding of Capital Goods for Agricultural Production implemented in coordination with the actions of other agriculture programs, especially when strategic projects are involved?

In particular:

a. Is carrying out the Program conceived as part of a comprehensive plan to promote the development of production activities in the rural area?

b. For the approval of the projects aided by the Program subject to this evaluation, is it considered a relevant criteria that the investments to be made contemplate complementary aid that strengthen their impact, such as training, technical assistance, plant and animal health covered in other programs?

14. In the current regulatory framework, is it contemplated that the Program should be coordinated with other rural development instruments, particularly in those cases where there is potential to achieve complementarity and synergies among them?

2.3.5 Serving the target population

The purpose of this topic is to assess if the Program has an implementation strategy that allows it to serve the population that it has defined as its target population, and to analyze the progress made in this respect.

The key aspects that are analyzed in this section are the targeting and the coverage of the Program. The analysis of the targeting is focused on determining if the Program is directing its resources toward the potential population that it considers a priority and/or strategic, following the logic of obtaining the expected results and the maximization of the impact of the subsidies. The purpose of the analysis of coverage is to assess to what degree or in what proportion the Program is able to serve its target population, also from the perspective of the expected results.

15. Based on the analysis of the characteristics of the population served by the Program, can it be affirmed that the beneficiaries that are receiving the aid belong to its target population? In other words, is the Program really reaching the intended population?
16. Do the areas responsible for the execution of the Program have (and use) any short and medium term implementing strategy to ensure that the resources granted are in fact channeled toward the target population?

17. Considering the information on the population served by the Program, is the progress in the coverage of the target population adequate in function of the objectives and targets of the Program?

18. Are the variables and ranges used in the rules of operation to define the strata of producers and the percentages of aid of the Program, for each subsector of activity (agriculture and livestock), adequate to ensure that the subsidies really reach the target population?

2.3.6 Reviewing of applications and projects

This topic analyzes the existence, use and pertinence of technical criteria for reviewing the viability of the applications and projects presented. It is sought to determine if for the implementation of the Program evaluated, standardized and pertinent procedures are defined and used that guarantee the selection of viable applications and projects that promise the greatest impacts and represent an effective contribution to achieving the objectives of the Program.

19. Are applications and projects to be aided by the Program selected based on the priorities defined in terms of the type of strategic capital goods that have been established as priorities?

20. Do standardized and pertinent technical criteria exist and are they used to review the projects with national or regional impact, so that those that make a greater contribution to achieving the expected results of the Program are chosen?

2.3.7 Allocation of the resources of the Program

Based on the available information regarding the progress in implementation, the primary areas of assistance of the Program in terms of agro-food chains, priority regions (according to degree of marginalization) and type of producers given aid will be identified. Additionally, the distribution of the resources of the Program will be assessed in function of the following criteria:

i) Assistance to producers organizations versus individual producers.

ii) Resources for primary production versus resources for post-harvest and transformation.

iii) Resources for assisting priority groups (youth, women, indigenous, older adults and/or disabled).

21. Is the observed allocation of the Program resources, in terms of supply chains, regions, producer strata and type of investments given aid to, adequate for achieving the expected results?

2.3.8 Compliance with the implementation processes

This topic involves an assessment of compliance with the key elements established in the national budget and in the rules of operation, whose observance contributes to achieving the Program’s expected results. It will be analyzed to what extent the resources are assigned and delivered in a timely manner, meeting the deadlines established in the corresponding regulations. It will also be evaluated whether the type of goods provided to the beneficiaries possesses the characteristics stipulated in the regulations, and whether such aid is delivered in a timely manner according to the deadlines established in the rules of operation and considering the production cycle of the activities given aid.
22. Are the different phases of the decision-making chain, from the dissemination of the Program to the delivery of the resources to the beneficiaries, developed according to the times established in the applicable regulations and with the quality required for such Program to meet its objectives?

23. Is the decision-making chain carried out with the timeliness required by the production cycle of the activities given aid?

24. Are the resources delivered to the Program and their spending initiated according to the time required to timely deliver the aid to the producers?

25. Do the implementing agencies prepare reports on the coverage progress and reports on the close of the fiscal year of the Program in a timely fashion and with the expected quality?

2.3.9 Following up on the aid given

The purpose of this topic is to evaluate if the Program has used mechanisms that allow it to assess to what extent the aid delivered is preserved, applied and/or used adequately by the beneficiaries, thereby contributing to achieving the medium and long term objectives.

26. Do the regulations of the Program require the implementing agencies to follow up on the projects given aid, in order to ensure the expected results are achieved?

27. Are changes in the current regulatory framework necessary to ensure that the units responsible for executing the Program follow up on the aid delivered in order to contribute to achieving the objectives of the Program?

2.3.10 Monitoring of the Program’s management

The purpose of this topic is to assess to what extent relevant information generated by the Program is recorded and used to follow up on its management. For that purpose, it will be analyzed whether the implementers of the Program make timely use of the information generated in order to identify emerging problems and introduce corrective measures that improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the Program and contribute to achieving the expected results.

28. Do those responsible for the implementation of the Program monitor the performance indicators in order to timely know the degree of progress in the Program’s management?

29. Does the monitoring of management indicators, if done, provide useful information that is being used by the implementers of the Program in order to introduce corrective measures that improve their efficiency and effectiveness?

2.3.11 Systematization of the information generated by the Program

Under this topic it will be assessed if the Program records and systematizes the information that the Program generates in each of its stages of implementation, from the dissemination process to the delivery and follow up on the aid delivered, such that the systematized information is sufficient in quantity, quality and timeliness to provide feedback for the management.
30. Is there any IT system that is used to systematically record the Program information?

31. Taking into account the characteristics of the system used (if any) in relation to the type of fields and variables it contains, the flexibility of its design and its functionality, is it considered to be an appropriate system for recording and making full use of the information on the management of the Program?

32. To what extent do the officers of the Ministry of Agriculture use in practice the information that is recorded in the IT system to give feedback on the Program’s management?

2.3.12 Transparency and accountability

The objective of this section is to provide feedback to management that can be used for an accountability system through which the public is informed of the results achieved and the transparency in management is improved. It will also be assessed to what extent the transparency mechanisms contained in the rules of operation are satisfied, such as publication of disaggregated results (according to gender, age group, region, etc.) and compliance with the budget caps, among other things.

33. Does the Ministry of Agriculture have an accountability system through which the public is informed of the results of the Program for the Funding of Capital Goods for Agricultural Production?

34. If dissemination mechanisms exist and are used, are they efficient and effective for learning the results of the Program?

35. Do the agencies responsible for the Program have transparency mechanisms regarding its management that function effectively, so that all the relevant information that is generated is accessible for all the possible interested stakeholders?

2.3.13 Quality in the service

It will be analyzed whether the Program has developed and uses any mechanism that records the opinion of the beneficiaries in relation to access to the subsidies, dissemination, response to requests for information, service at the application filing desk, treatment received when problems and complaints were raised, timeliness in notifying the decision on their application and delivery of the aid, and compliance with the transparency mechanisms in the execution of the Program, among other relevant aspects of its management and implementation. In order to complement and add context to the information provided by the beneficiaries of the Program on the quality in the service, the opinion of the implementers of the aid and of other related actors will also be considered.

36. Do the agencies responsible for the Program use any instrument considered adequate to measure the degree of satisfaction of the users of the aid?

37. If there is no instrument for measuring the satisfaction of the users, what type of variables and scales of measurement should be considered for its design?

2.3.14 Incorporation of improvements in the Program’s management

This topic will assess to what extent it is feasible to retrieve lessons learned on best management practices derived from the execution of the physical investment program promoted in prior years by the Ministry of Agriculture.
38. What type of management practices that proved to be effective in the execution of the capital goods aid programs implemented by the Ministry of Agriculture in recent years can be replicated successfully in implementing the Program for the Funding of Capital Goods for Agricultural Production?

39. What areas of improvement are identified in the current management of the Program which if addressed would make it possible to increase its efficiency and effectiveness?

2.3.15 Global assessment of the functioning and implementation of the Program

Based on the analysis of each of the topics concerning the execution of the Program, in this section an overall assessment will be done in order to determine if it is being implemented comprehensively and with the efficiency and effectiveness required to achieve the expected results.

2.4 Sources of information

The main sources of information that should be consulted at a minimum for the evaluation of the functioning and implementation of the Program are indicated below.

2.4.1 Documentary information

a) Sector policy documents
   - National development plan
   - Sector program of the Ministry of Agriculture

b) Regulatory documents
   - Rural development law of the country
   - Rules of operation of the Program
   - Technical annexes of execution of the Program
   - National government expenditures budget decree

c) Documents on the design of the Program
   - Logical Framework of the Program for the Funding of Capital Goods for Agricultural Production
   - Results of the design evaluation of the Program for the Funding of Capital Goods for Agricultural Production

d) Evaluations of prior programs
   - Processes evaluation reports of recent similar programs
e) Databases

The databases of the Program provided by the Ministry of Agriculture will be consulted, such as lists of Program beneficiaries and projects given aid, budget amounts assigned and spent, and coverage progress reports, among others.

2.4.2 Interviews of officers and other actors related to the implementation of the Program

In order to complement the information collected through documentary sources, interviews and work meeting will be carried out with the responsible officers of the Program and other actors related to its execution. For this purpose, the evaluator will prepare a questionnaire and/or interview guide in order to obtain the relevant information for the evaluation of the Program.
TOOL 3

Sampling method for a mini-survey to collect information for monitoring indicators

Considering the time and funding restrictions of the program or project for monitoring indicators, it is suggested to use a mini-survey, which has the following advantages, among others:

- The mini-survey makes it possible to focus on topics identified and narrowed down by the performance indicators selected for such purpose.

- The size of the sample of a mini-survey is small with respect to other types of surveys. Depending on the sampling method the number of units to survey may vary in a range from 70 to 210 observation units.

- The mini-survey is flexible in regard to the sampling method, making it possible to use an informal convenience method or a probability sampling method. The decision depends on the financial resources and the time available.

- The mini-survey is a low cost method of collecting information that generates quantitative information. It is also a practical instrument that allows a quick and exhaustive collection of the information required for the monitoring.

Nevertheless, there are certain limitations of the instrument that should be kept in mind, among which are the following:

- The results tend to be less generalized than those obtained from larger samplings; however, the effect of this can be reduced using a probability sampling method which makes it possible to know with certainty the statistical error.

- In some cases the small sample can imply the loss of information on specific groups, which can also be prevented with the definition of an adequate sampling method.

- Credibility is always a problem with mini-surveys, in spite of the reliability of their sample. Decision makers may conclude that it is not possible to generalize from a small sample, and therefore it is relevant to ensure the internal consistency of the sample and communicate this. With respect to this limitation, using a probability sampling method for the mini-survey contributes greater credibility than if informal sampling methods are chosen.

3.1 Sampling method

The sampling method suggested for a mini-survey is the Two-Stage Cluster Sampling (TSCS). The selection of this method is justified by the advantages it offers, which are:

- Providing a reliable solution, which is practical and low cost, in relation to other simple sampling methods, to address situations where the beneficiaries of the intervention are geographically disbursed.

- Facilitates the probabilistic selection of users when there is no reliable list of the beneficiaries of the intervention.
• The method makes it possible to simplify the process of conducting surveys and, therefore, it reduces the time and cost required.

The TSCS is based on the principle that it is possible to stratify the population to survey from its own characteristics or geographically. The principal characteristic of the TSCS is that it must be implemented, as the name suggests, in two stages in which simple probability sampling methods and non-probability sampling methods can be combined. There is a TSCS called TSCS 30x7 that offers certain advantages. This method was designed and implemented to measure results such as coverage and quality of the services with 95% reliability of a sample composed of 210 observations (Figure 8).

The procedure followed to implement the TSCS 30x7 is to define geographic strata or groups (this selection can be random or informal by convenience) and in each of these geographic strata a simple sampling should be applied to select the number of cases to survey. Once the strata are selected a simple sampling is applied to the interior of each stratus in order to select the units to survey. Following this logic, the size of the sampling is determined by the number 30x7, which refers to the stages and quantity of units to be observed after applying the sampling. For example, 30x7 means that once 30 strata are defined (regions, municipalities, localities, geographic zones, blocks, etc.) 7 units should be selected randomly to survey in each one, which give a sample size of 210 observations.

Below is an example of the procedure for doing such a sampling.

As a reference it can be established that for a population of 100,000 observations a simple sampling collects a sampling of 398 observations.
3.2 Example of the procedure to follow for monitoring sampling

3.2.1 First stage: Defining the regions or municipalities that will be visited

The steps to follow for determining the sample for a mini-survey through the TSCS method are presented in an example below.

Step 1. Preparation of the sampling framework

To prepare the sampling framework an extensive list of the regions and of the applications for aid that were approved in each of them must be prepared. The approved applications are those decided positively and for which it can be verified that the aid was in fact delivered. The list of approved applications in this case is equal to the number of beneficiaries of the program or project.

In this step it is not necessary for the list of regions or applications to be in an ascending or descending order. In fact, it is preferable that this list be recorded randomly on a spreadsheet, or organized according to geographic distribution; that is by region.

**SUGGESTION:** When the suggested minimum geographic unit of 30 regions or more is not met, an effort can be made to compose the sampling framework by obtaining information from applications at the municipal level. This will expand the possibilities for selection of the geographic clusters that should be selected in this first stage of sampling.

In the example, the data correspond to a fictitious country called Sampleland, in which there are 20 regions and 46 municipalities (Table 15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Number of municipalities</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Number of municipalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Region 11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Region 12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Region 13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Region 14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Region 15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Region 16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Region 17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Region 18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Region 19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Region 20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total municipalities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total municipalities</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Step 2. Calculation of the cumulative number of applications

In the order in which the data are recorded the cumulative sum of approved applications in each of the regions of the area being monitored should be calculated. The range of values or distance between the values of the cumulative sum should also be defined.

For example, in Table 16, the cumulative sum of the approved applications and the ranges between the values of this sum for the state of Sampleland is shown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Approved applications</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Cumulative sum of approved applications</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1,088</td>
<td>997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1,431</td>
<td>1,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1,689</td>
<td>1,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1,899</td>
<td>1,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1,956</td>
<td>1,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2,160</td>
<td>1,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2,181</td>
<td>2,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2,281</td>
<td>2,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2,355</td>
<td>2,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2,670</td>
<td>2,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2,675</td>
<td>2,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2,737</td>
<td>2,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2,774</td>
<td>2,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,774</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 16. Approved Requests by Region of Sampleland and Cumulative Sum**
Step 3. Calculate the Sampling Interval (SI)

To calculate the SI it is necessary to divide the total amount of the approved applications (beneficiaries) by the number of regions or municipalities that it is decided to visit. In the case of the TSCS 30x7 the number of territorial units to visit is 30. However, as was mentioned previously, this amount may vary depending on the combination of territorial entities to visit and the number of questionnaires to apply in order to ensure a sampling size of approximately 210 units to survey (results of the sample size applying the TSCS 30x7). This last decision, in turn, may vary depending on:

- The availability of more detailed information at the municipal level (which would increase the possibility of territorial units to visit)
- The availability of resources to cover more territory
- The influx of applications by region/municipality.

\[
SI = \frac{\text{Total number of beneficiaries}}{\text{Total number of regions/Municipalities to visit}}
\]

\[
SI_{(\text{TSCS 30x7})} = \frac{\text{Total number of beneficiaries}}{30}
\]

Based on the above, the following three scenarios can be discerned:

1. There are no more than 30 regions and there are budgetary restrictions.
2. There are no more than 30 regions and there are sufficient resources.
3. Municipal information was obtained and greater territorial strata can be covered.

**Scenario 1**

Assuming that in Sampleland there is no information with greater detail than by region, the relationship 30x7 reverses to 7x30; that is, 7 regions and 30 units to survey in each one. Based on the above, the Sampling Interval (SI) is calculated dividing the number of approved applications (2,774) by the 7 defined visits, which results in 396.29.

The SI is used at this time as a reference for randomly selecting a number between 0 and 396 (that is, between 0 and the result of the SI obtained), with which the first cluster or region to visit will be chosen.

---

35 It is not recommended to select a random number mentally, since this implies a certain bias. To reduce the possibility of this bias it is suggested to use a table of random numbers (see Annex 1) or an automatic generator of these numbers. One possibility is to use the tool in Excel or look for a generator on the Internet, for which the following Web pages are suggested: http://www.random.org/ or http://nosetup.org/php_on_line/numero_aleatorio_2
Scenario 2

Assuming that Sampleland has sufficient resources to cover a larger number of regions, a quantity of 10 regions is selected to visit. This decision is based on there being 10 regions that concentrate 80% of the approved applications (Table 16). With this information the SI is calculated and a random number is selected within a range from 0 to the SI = 277.

\[
SI_{(TSCS \ 10x30)} = \frac{2,774}{7} = 396.29
\]

Select a random number between 0 and 396.29
Random number (RN) = 174

\[
SI_{(TSCS \ 10x30)} = \frac{2,774}{10} = 277.40 \quad RN = 201
\]

Scenario 3

Assuming that in Sampleland it is possible to obtain detailed information at the municipal level, the options for selecting clusters or territorial units expand from 20 regions to 46 municipalities. In this case the rule of TSCS 30x7 is chosen; in other words, it is decided to maintain the decision to visit 30 municipalities and survey 7 units in each municipality. With this decision the same procedure is used to calculate the SI and a random number is selected in a range from 0 to the SI = 92.

\[
SI_{(TSCS \ 30x7)} = \frac{2,774}{30} = 92.47 \quad RN = 67
\]

Step 4. Based on the SI calculate the data that will make it possible to select the clusters (regions/municipalities to visit)

To calculate the data necessary to select the rest of the clusters the random number selected (first cluster selected) should be added to the SI. This is calculated until the last option of number of regions/municipalities to visit is exhausted. Continuing with the three scenarios, the following are the results:
Scenario 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 2</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>396.29</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 3</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>396.29</td>
<td>967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 4</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>396.29</td>
<td>1,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 5</td>
<td>1,363</td>
<td>396.29</td>
<td>1,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 6</td>
<td>1,759</td>
<td>396.29</td>
<td>2,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 7</td>
<td>2,155</td>
<td>396.29</td>
<td>2,552</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Random number selected: 174, 396

\[ A + B = C \]
\[ 174 + 396 = 570 \]

Scenario 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 2</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>277.40</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 3</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>277.40</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 4</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>277.40</td>
<td>1,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 5</td>
<td>1,033</td>
<td>277.40</td>
<td>1,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 6</td>
<td>1,311</td>
<td>277.40</td>
<td>1,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 7</td>
<td>1,588</td>
<td>277.40</td>
<td>1,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 8</td>
<td>1,865</td>
<td>277.40</td>
<td>2,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 9</td>
<td>2,143</td>
<td>277.40</td>
<td>2,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 10</td>
<td>2,420</td>
<td>277.40</td>
<td>2,698</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Scenario 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 2</td>
<td>67.00</td>
<td>92.47</td>
<td>159.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 3</td>
<td>159.47</td>
<td>92.47</td>
<td>251.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 4</td>
<td>251.93</td>
<td>92.47</td>
<td>344.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 5</td>
<td>344.40</td>
<td>92.47</td>
<td>436.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 6</td>
<td>436.87</td>
<td>92.47</td>
<td>529.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 7</td>
<td>529.33</td>
<td>92.47</td>
<td>621.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 8</td>
<td>621.80</td>
<td>92.47</td>
<td>714.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 9</td>
<td>714.27</td>
<td>92.47</td>
<td>806.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 10</td>
<td>806.73</td>
<td>92.47</td>
<td>899.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 11</td>
<td>899.20</td>
<td>92.47</td>
<td>991.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 12</td>
<td>991.67</td>
<td>92.47</td>
<td>1,084.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 13</td>
<td>1,084.13</td>
<td>92.47</td>
<td>1,176.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 14</td>
<td>1,176.60</td>
<td>92.47</td>
<td>1,269.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 15</td>
<td>1,269.07</td>
<td>92.47</td>
<td>1,361.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 16</td>
<td>1,361.53</td>
<td>92.47</td>
<td>1,454.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 17</td>
<td>1,454.00</td>
<td>92.47</td>
<td>1,546.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 18</td>
<td>1,546.47</td>
<td>92.47</td>
<td>1,638.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 19</td>
<td>1,638.93</td>
<td>92.47</td>
<td>1,731.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 20</td>
<td>1,731.40</td>
<td>92.47</td>
<td>1,823.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 21</td>
<td>1,823.87</td>
<td>92.47</td>
<td>1,916.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 22</td>
<td>1,916.33</td>
<td>92.47</td>
<td>2,008.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 23</td>
<td>2,008.80</td>
<td>92.47</td>
<td>2,101.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 24</td>
<td>2,101.27</td>
<td>92.47</td>
<td>2,193.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 25</td>
<td>2,193.73</td>
<td>92.47</td>
<td>2,286.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 26</td>
<td>2,286.20</td>
<td>92.47</td>
<td>2,378.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 27</td>
<td>2,378.67</td>
<td>92.47</td>
<td>2,471.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 28</td>
<td>2,471.13</td>
<td>92.47</td>
<td>2,563.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 29</td>
<td>2,563.60</td>
<td>92.47</td>
<td>2,656.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 30</td>
<td>2,656.07</td>
<td>92.47</td>
<td>2,748.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Step 5. Select the regions/municipalities to visit

Based on the calculations done in Step 4 the regions or municipalities to visit are selected. For this the region/municipality list determined in Table 16 should be considered and those in which the number of column C falls within the ranges determined in Table 16 should be selected.

Continuing with the sample scenarios the following selections can be made:

Scenario 1: (7x30)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Approved applications</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Cumulative Sum</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Column C calculated in step 4</th>
<th>Cluster chosen</th>
<th>Number of units to survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>399</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>777</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>919</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1,088</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>1,088</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1,431</td>
<td>1,089</td>
<td>1,431</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1,689</td>
<td>1,432</td>
<td>1,689</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1,899</td>
<td>1,690</td>
<td>1,899</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1,956</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>1,956</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2,160</td>
<td>1,957</td>
<td>2,160</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2,181</td>
<td>2,161</td>
<td>2,181</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2,281</td>
<td>2,182</td>
<td>2,281</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2,355</td>
<td>2,282</td>
<td>2,355</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2,670</td>
<td>2,356</td>
<td>2,670</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2,675</td>
<td>2,671</td>
<td>2,675</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2,737</td>
<td>2,676</td>
<td>2,737</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2,774</td>
<td>2,738</td>
<td>2,774</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,774</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Scenario 2: (10x21)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Approved applications</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Cumulative Sum</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Cluster chosen</th>
<th>Number of units to survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>399</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>836</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>919</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1,088</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>1,088</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1,431</td>
<td>1,089</td>
<td>1,431</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1,689</td>
<td>1,432</td>
<td>1,689</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1,899</td>
<td>1,690</td>
<td>1,899</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1,956</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>1,956</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2,160</td>
<td>1,957</td>
<td>2,160</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2,181</td>
<td>2,161</td>
<td>2,181</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2,281</td>
<td>2,182</td>
<td>2,281</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2,355</td>
<td>2,282</td>
<td>2,355</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2,670</td>
<td>2,356</td>
<td>2,670</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2,675</td>
<td>2,671</td>
<td>2,675</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2,737</td>
<td>2,676</td>
<td>2,737</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2,774</td>
<td>2,738</td>
<td>2,774</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,774</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td><strong>210</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Scenario 3: (30x7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Approved applications</th>
<th>Cumulative Sum</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Cluster chosen</th>
<th>Number of units to survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>134.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>259.00</td>
<td>135.00</td>
<td>259.00</td>
<td>2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>269.00</td>
<td>260.00</td>
<td>269.00</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>301.00</td>
<td>270.00</td>
<td>301.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>396.00</td>
<td>302.00</td>
<td>396.00</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,774</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>Approved applications</td>
<td>Cumulative Sum</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Cluster chosen</td>
<td>Number of units to survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>420.00</td>
<td>397.00</td>
<td>420.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>421.00</td>
<td>421.00</td>
<td>421.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>484.00</td>
<td>422.00</td>
<td>484.00</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>508.00</td>
<td>485.00</td>
<td>508.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>533.00</td>
<td>509.00</td>
<td>533.00</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>597.00</td>
<td>534.00</td>
<td>597.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>599.00</td>
<td>598.00</td>
<td>599.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>712.00</td>
<td>600.00</td>
<td>712.00</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>803.00</td>
<td>713.00</td>
<td>803.00</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>830.00</td>
<td>804.00</td>
<td>830.00</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>906.00</td>
<td>831.00</td>
<td>906.00</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>998.00</td>
<td>907.00</td>
<td>998.00</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>1,114.00</td>
<td>999.00</td>
<td>1,114.00</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1,133.00</td>
<td>1,115.00</td>
<td>1,133.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,137.00</td>
<td>1,134.00</td>
<td>1,137.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>1,479.00</td>
<td>1,138.00</td>
<td>1,479.00</td>
<td>13,14,15,16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1,508.00</td>
<td>1,480.00</td>
<td>1,508.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1,547.00</td>
<td>1,509.00</td>
<td>1,547.00</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1,565.00</td>
<td>1,548.00</td>
<td>1,565.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1,660.00</td>
<td>1,566.00</td>
<td>1,660.00</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>1,859.00</td>
<td>1,661.00</td>
<td>1,859.00</td>
<td>19,20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,869.00</td>
<td>1,860.00</td>
<td>1,869.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1,922.00</td>
<td>1,870.00</td>
<td>1,922.00</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1,973.00</td>
<td>1,923.00</td>
<td>1,973.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1,991.00</td>
<td>1,974.00</td>
<td>1,991.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2,066.00</td>
<td>1,992.00</td>
<td>2,066.00</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2,139.00</td>
<td>2,067.00</td>
<td>2,139.00</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>2,216.00</td>
<td>2,140.00</td>
<td>2,216.00</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2,227.00</td>
<td>2,217.00</td>
<td>2,227.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2,265.00</td>
<td>2,228.00</td>
<td>2,265.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2,269.00</td>
<td>2,266.00</td>
<td>2,269.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2,335.00</td>
<td>2,270.00</td>
<td>2,335.00</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.2.2 Second stage: Determining the units to survey in each region selected

Once the regions or municipalities to visit are selected (by means of the first stage of the sampling) then the second stage can begin. In the second stage the units to survey in each region or municipality are selected.

To make this selection the systematic simple sampling method is followed. In this case, the procedure is facilitated since the sample size is already determined and it is 30 sample units per region in the first scenario of the sample; 21 units to survey per region in the second scenario and 7 units to survey per municipality in the third scenario of the example.

Below are the suggested steps for selecting the units to survey in the first scenario.

**Step 1**

The beneficiaries given aid for each listed region are listed. In the sample (Scenario 1) the number of beneficiaries is reduced from 2,774 to 1,724 according to Table 17:
IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING

Region selected applications approved (beneficiaries) Cluster Number of units to survey

1 270 1 30
3 305 2 30
7 77 3 30
9 343 4 30
11 210 5 30
13 204 6 30
17 315 7 30

Total 1,724  210

Step 2

With this list a reference number, \( k \), can be calculated which is the result of dividing the final number of beneficiaries in each region/municipality selected by the total number of questionnaires to apply in that territorial unit. In the sample the following numbers \( k \) (Table 18) are obtained for the seven regions selected.

Step 3

A random number, \( i \), should be selected for each region/municipality selected, which falls between 0 and \( k \) (\( k=11 \) for the case of region 9). For that it is suggested to use the electronic Web sites or the table suggested in section 4.1 of Step 3. To continue with the example, and limited to the specific case of the fourth region selected, the number \( i=6 \) is selected randomly, which falls between 0 and \( k=11 \) for the case of region 9.

Step 4

Based on this number, the number of observations (units to survey) in region 9 can be calculated adding \( i+k \) and generating 30 iterations (for the number of questionnaires to apply in that region). In Table 19 the result is shown.
### TABLE 19. RESULTS OF STEP 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaires to apply</th>
<th>$i$</th>
<th>$k$</th>
<th>Unit to survey selected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Step 5**

From the list of approved applications corresponding to region 9, select those that correspond to the unit column selected in Step 4 to apply the questionnaire for the calculation of the indicators.

**Step 6**

Repeat Steps 1 to 5 for each region or municipality selected in the first stage of the sampling and apply the questionnaire for the calculation of indicators.
Tool 4

Sampling method for the collection of information for monitoring the quality of the service and the follow up on the aid of a program or project

Lot Quality Assurance Sampling (LQAS) is the sampling method suggested for monitoring the quality of the service and follow up on the aid of the program or project. The LQAS method was originally developed as an industrial technique of the production quality control area because manufacturers were interested in determining if a large number of goods met a required minimum quality standard. Thus, instead of reviewing all the products of a production lot, a sample is taken and according to the result it is decided whether to accept or reject the entire lot. The advantage of this sampling is that the selected sample of each lot is small, and thus the cost of monitoring the quality is reduced.

LQAS is a method that combines two standard statistical techniques: stratified sample for the collection of data and unilateral hypothesis tests for data analysis. The sampling principles are universal, so that for the specific case of monitoring (the quality in the service and the follow up on the aid) a program or project, the application of this methodology can provide all the relevant information required with the following advantages:

- Since it is a variant of random stratified sampling it is possible to reach conclusions using small samples;
- It makes it possible to identify (and measure) areas that require corrective actions;
- It makes it possible to infer for the whole population;
- The method is considered a “feedback tool” that provides information for decision making intended to improve the program service.

4.1 Application of the LQAS

In general, the first step of the LQAS consists of dividing the population under study into geographic monitoring areas (localities, municipalities, regions, etc.) called lots. After defining the monitoring areas or lots, the sampling framework is formed from which a size sample \( n \) is taken using simple random sampling in each monitoring area to survey. Finally, the results of each lot can be combined in a global estimator of the total study area, weighting the results of each monitoring area with the size of its population in order to obtain a total average.

Step 1. Define the monitoring areas

The first step for applying the LQAS is to define the monitoring areas. Here it is crucial to consider the area at the minimum administrative level possible for which the results can be used in decision making. It is worth noting that the lower the level of administration, the greater number of areas of supervision there will be and the sample size will increase, with which the original benefit of the LQAS is eliminated. Therefore, it is important to be aware that the sample size is compromised by the increase in the areas to monitor. However, it is also important that the areas of supervision cover all the geographic area of interest.
Step 2. Identification of the sampling framework and calculation of the sample

Once the monitoring areas are defined the entire population of the monitoring areas should be listed, since the LQAS requires a random sampling of size $n$ of each of them.

It is important to have an estimate of the population under study, as well as a list from which to take the size $n$ random sample.

The sample size is calculated based on LQAS tables, in which the level of reliability required is specified. The tables used for this case are found in Table 20.

4.2 Application of LQAS for monitoring service quality and follow up on the aid of a program or project

Step 1. Determine the monitoring areas

The LQAS requires that the monitoring subareas (geographic strata) that without overlap cover all the geographic area to monitor be determined. The minimum number of subareas of monitoring should be five, and therefore the area of interest to be monitored must be divided into five subareas or regions without overlap (Figure 9).

Thus, the monitoring area will be divided into five monitoring subareas that do not overlap, as in Figure 9.

FIGURE 9. EXAMPLE OF THE AREA AND THE FIVE SUBAREAS OF MONITORING36

36 The division inside the subareas should correspond to the municipal or locality division or some other type of administrative unit.
Step 2. Identification of the sample framework and calculation of the sample

Once the five monitoring areas (without overlap) are decided upon, then the sample framework is formed, which will be given by the list of beneficiaries.

Once the list of beneficiaries is obtained they are separated into the five monitoring subareas that correspond to it.

Subsequently the sample size for each subarea is calculated, which will be given by the level of reliability required (it is suggested to set it at 95%). According to the LQAS tables (Table 20), the sample size \( n \) in each monitoring area will be 19. Thus, the total size of the sample will be 95; in other words, five monitoring subareas with 19 elements each.

Once the sample size for each monitoring subarea is determined, 19 in this case, the simple random sampling is applied in order to define which unit to survey. To obtain the sample to interview the following is done:

- The list of beneficiaries of the program or project is divided into the five monitoring subareas.
- The names are organized upwards by last name of all the members of each monitoring subarea and they are numbered; in other words, there will be five partitions of the total list and each of these partitions will be organized and numbered upwards by last name.
- 19 random numbers are calculated for each subarea and the units corresponding to each random number in each monitoring subarea are taken.
- At the end there will be 19 elements, selected randomly, for each of the five monitoring subareas, making a total of 95 elements.

### TABLE 20. LQAS FOR THE CALCULATION OF THE OPTIMUM SAMPLE SIZE AT A 95% CONFIDENCE LEVEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coverage Sample</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>25%</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>35%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>45%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>55%</th>
<th>60%</th>
<th>65%</th>
<th>70%</th>
<th>75%</th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>85%</th>
<th>90%</th>
<th>95%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOOL 5

Questionnaire for monitoring the quality of service of a program or project

I. Dissemination of the program

1. How did you learn about the existence of the program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Radio (1) ___</th>
<th>Television (2) ___</th>
<th>Newspaper (3) ___</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Governmental office (4) ___</td>
<td>Organization to which you belong (5) ___</td>
<td>Other (6) _________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. At the service window did they provide you with information on the program

Yes: (1) [ ] No: (0) [ ]

If the answer is No, go to question 4.

3. Was the information they gave you on the program sufficient to know the types of aid the program grants?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes: (0) ___</th>
<th>No: (1) ___</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes: (0) ___</td>
<td>No: (1) ___</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1/ Ask if the response to question 2 was “Yes”.
2/ Ask for each of the programs to which there was a response in question 1.

II. Application for aid

4. How much time passed between the delivery of your application and/or documentation and the reception of the program aid?

| Indicate the month and the year in which you applied for and received the aid |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Applied for the aid:          | Received the aid:             |
| month _________ year:_______  | month _________ year:_______  |
5. Was it easy to fill out the application for the program aid?

Assign a value from 1 to 10: 1 if you completely disagree and 10 if you completely agree

(1)___  (2)___  (3)___  (4)___  (5)___  (6)___  (7)___
(8)___  (9)___  (10)___

6. Was the processing of your application for the program aid easy?

Assign a value from 1 to 10: 1 if you completely disagree and 10 if you completely agree

(1)___  (2)___  (3)___  (4)___  (5)___  (6)___  (7)___
(8)___  (9)___  (10)___

III. Reviewing of applications

7. Did they ask you for any gratification for processing the application or for granting the program aid?

1 Mark with an X the corresponding response

Yes: (1)___  No: (0)___

8. Did you know the criteria used for reviewing the applications for the program aid?

1 Mark with an X the corresponding response

Yes: (1)___  No: (0)___

9. How much time passed between the delivery of your application and the notification of the results on the program aid?

Indicate the month and the year in which you applied and received the results

Delivered the application in: month_________ year:______
Received the results: month_________ year:______
IV. Rating of the program personnel

10. In general how did the personnel when you delivered your application for program aid treat you?

Mark with an X the corresponding response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poorly: (0)___</th>
<th>Normal: (1)____</th>
<th>Good: (2)____</th>
<th>Excellent: (3)____</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

11. Is there a complaints and suggestions box in the service window where you delivered your request for program aid?

Mark with an X the corresponding response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No: (0)___</th>
<th>Yes: (1)___</th>
<th>Doesn’t know: ____</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

V. Rating of the aid

12. Was the aid that the program granted to you delivered in a timely fashion?

Mark with an X the corresponding response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes: (1)___</th>
<th>No: (0)___</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

13. Was the type of aid received from the program what you need?

Mark with an X the corresponding response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes: (1)___</th>
<th>No: (0)___</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

14. Is the amount of program aid received sufficient for what you need?

Mark with an X the corresponding response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes: (1)___</th>
<th>No: (0)___</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

VI. Rating of satisfaction

15. Would you recommend others to apply for the program aid?

Mark with an X the corresponding response

| Yes: (1)___ | No: (0)___ |
TOOL 6

Questionnaire for monitoring the follow up on the aid granted by a program or project

1. **Interviewer:** with information from the file\(^1\) of the beneficiary record the following information on the program aid received.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of aid (Components of aid)(^2)</th>
<th>Specify the concept of aid received(^3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Production infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinery and equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant material, animal and aquatic species</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1/ These data are obtained from the beneficiary application file.
2/ The types of aid correspond to the Components considered in the rules of operation of the program.
3/ Note the specific concept of aid granted and indicated in the beneficiary file. This is the aid that should be followed up on in the field.

2. Did you receive the program aid applied for?

   **Mark with an X the corresponding response**

   Yes: (1) [ ] No: (0) [ ]

3. Does the aid received correspond to what you requested from the program?

   **Mark with an X the corresponding response**

   Yes: (1) [ ] No: (0) [ ]

4. Did you receive the aid that the program delivered to you in the time established or as promised?

   **Mark with an X the corresponding response**

   Yes: (1) [ ] No: (0) [ ]
5. Are you keeping the aid that the program granted you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of aid (Components of aid)²</th>
<th>Specific concept of aid²</th>
<th>Mark with an X the corresponding response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Production infrastructure</td>
<td>Yes: (1) No: (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinery and equipment</td>
<td>Yes: (1) No: (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant material, animal and aquatic species</td>
<td>Yes: (1) No: (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, validation and technology transfer</td>
<td>Yes: (1) No: (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical assistance and training</td>
<td>Yes: (1) No: (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal health and food safety services</td>
<td>Yes: (1) No: (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market development</td>
<td>Yes: (1) No: (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biogenetic and biodiversity resources</td>
<td>Yes: (1) No: (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production conversion</td>
<td>Yes: (1) No: (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquaculture and fishing</td>
<td>Yes: (1) No: (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>Yes: (1) No: (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissemination</td>
<td>Yes: (1) No: (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating expenses</td>
<td>Yes: (1) No: (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1/ The types of aid correspond to the Components considered in the rules of operation of the program.
2/ Corresponds to the concept of aid specified in the last column of question 1.

6. Why didn't you preserve the aid that the program granted you²?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of aid (Components of aid)²</th>
<th>Specific concept of the aid³:</th>
<th>Sold the aid:</th>
<th>The aid died⁴ or was destroyed⁵:</th>
<th>It was stolen:</th>
<th>Other reasons (specify):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Production infrastructure</td>
<td>Yes: (1) No: (0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes: (1) No: (0)</td>
<td>Yes: (1) No: (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinery and equipment</td>
<td>Yes: (1) No: (0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes: (1) No: (0)</td>
<td>Yes: (1) No: (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant material, animal and aquatic species</td>
<td>Yes: (1) No: (0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes: (1) No: (0)</td>
<td>Yes: (1) No: (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1/ Ask about the aid received for which the option “No” was marked in question 5.
2/ The types of aid correspond to the Components considered in the rules of operation of the program.
3/ Corresponds to the concept of aid specified in the last column of question 1.
4/ In the case of animals or plant material. Also include when the beneficiary used the aid for consumption in the household.
5/ In acts of God such as earthquakes, fires, hurricanes, etc.
7. Do you implement the aid you received from the program? 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of aid (Components of aid)</th>
<th>Specific concept of the aid(^2):</th>
<th>Mark with an X the corresponding answer:</th>
<th>In what capacity do you use the aid granted? (Mark with an X the corresponding response):</th>
<th>Keeps the assets but does not use them because(^3):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Production infrastructure</td>
<td>Yes: (1) No: (0)</td>
<td>25% ☐ 50% ☐ 75% ☐ 100% ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinery and equipment</td>
<td>Yes: (1) No: (0)</td>
<td>25% ☐ 50% ☐ 75% ☐ 100% ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant material, animal and aquatic species</td>
<td>Yes: (1) No: (0)</td>
<td>25% ☐ 50% ☐ 75% ☐ 100% ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1/ Ask for the aid received for which the option “Yes” was marked in question 5.
2/ Corresponds to the concept of aid specified in the last column of question 1.
3/ Note the response given by the interviewee.
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