

Livelihoods Monitoring and Evaluation: A Rapid Desk Based Study



Katherine Pasteur

February 2014



**EVIDENCE
ON DEMAND**

CLIMATE & ENVIRONMENT
INFRASTRUCTURE | LIVELIHOODS



This report has been produced by Practical Action Consulting for Evidence on Demand with the assistance of the UK Department for International Development (DFID) contracted through the Climate, Environment, Infrastructure and Livelihoods Professional Evidence and Applied Knowledge Services (CEIL PEAKS) programme, jointly managed by HTSPE Limited and IMC Worldwide Limited.

The views expressed in the report are entirely those of the author and do not necessarily represent DFID's own views or policies, or those of Evidence on Demand. Comments and discussion on items related to content and opinion should be addressed to the author, via enquiries@evidenceondemand.org

Your feedback helps us ensure the quality and usefulness of all knowledge products. Please email enquiries@evidenceondemand.org and let us know whether or not you have found this material useful; in what ways it has helped build your knowledge base and informed your work; or how it could be improved.

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.12774/eod_hd.feb2014.pasteur





Contents

Report Summary	ii
SECTION 1	1
Introduction	1
Purpose of the review.....	1
What is meant by Monitoring and Evaluation	1
Methodology and methodological challenges.....	1
SECTION 2	3
Methods for M&E.....	3
State of evidence.....	3
Overview of approaches.....	3
Collation of existing data sources.....	4
Quantitative	4
Mixed.....	4
Qualitative	5
Innovative.....	5
SECTION 3	7
Indicators for M&E.....	7
State of Evidence	7
Overview of Indicator sources and approaches	7
How gender is dealt with	10
SECTION 4	11
Annotated Bibliography and References	11
References.....	20

List of Tables

Table 1 Comparing Monitoring, Evaluation and Impact Assessment.....	1
---	---



Report Summary

This report is the outcome of a rapid desk study to identify and collate the current state of evidence and best practice for monitoring and evaluating programmes that aim to have a livelihoods impact. The study identifies tried and tested approaches and indicators that can be applied across a range of livelihoods programming. The main focus of the report is an annotated bibliography of literature sources relevant to the theme which can be found in Section 4. The narrative report highlights key themes and examples from the literature relating to methods (Section 2) and indicators (Section 3). This collection of resources is intended to form the starting point for a more thorough organisation and analysis of material for the final formation of a Topic Guide on Livelihoods Indicators.



SECTION 1

Introduction

Purpose of the review

This paper is a desk-based study to identify and collect the current state of evidence and best practice for monitoring and evaluating programmes that aim to have a livelihoods impact. The study aims to identify tried and tested approaches and indicators that can be applied across a range of livelihoods programming. The purpose of the study is to inform the development of a Topic Guide on Livelihood Indicators.

What is meant by Monitoring and Evaluation

The term Monitoring and Evaluation can cover a multitude of different aspects of measurement or learning about development interventions. In general, three distinct aspects can be identified: 'monitoring', 'evaluation' and 'impact assessment' (sometimes termed impact evaluation) which can be distinguished according to purpose, timing and analytical level, as outlined in the following table.

	Monitoring	Evaluation	Impact assessment
Purpose	Systematic / continuous assessment to determine progress to goal	To review extent to which objectives achieved as anticipated. Supply lessons learned to improve future actions, planning and decision making.	Systematic analysis of significant change (positive or negative) lasting or not, brought about by a given action or series of actions
Timing	Systematic / continuous	Periodic. Often mid-way or at end of an initiative	After a considerable period of time when lasting change is expected. Often following completion of initiative – could be post-hoc
Analytical Level	Mainly descriptive, regarding progress – mainly focusing on inputs, activities and outputs	More analytical than monitoring. Examines processes and outcomes. Explores issues of sustainability, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and relevance of design.	Mainly analytical and concerned with analysing and understanding lasting change – at outcome / goal level Can raise large scale strategic issues for organisation

Table 1 Comparing Monitoring, Evaluation and Impact Assessment

Adapted from Turrall and Studd 2009

Methodology and methodological challenges

To source relevant information, the author conducted tailored searches via internet search engines, and explored donor and NGO reports, and repositories of international development institutes and think-tanks. The author also checked bibliographies and reference lists from academic papers and Monitoring and Evaluation online resource platforms to find other sources.



Within the allotted time the author has found a wide range of different references to M&E of projects with a livelihoods focus, making it difficult to synthesise lessons from such a diverse set of experiences. The diversity includes types of organisation, scales of intervention (from localised project to cross continental programme), contexts, sectors, focus and objectives. As such it has been hard to draw patterns or collate “bodies of experience” as often only one example of a particular methodology or indicators for a particular sector were found.

Much of the literature on M&E constitutes theory based guidelines which are not grounded in practical examples illustrating that the concepts are tried and tested. Documentation of actual baselines, monitoring studies or evaluation reports principally focus on communicating results, with less focus on explaining methodology and detailing indicators. Any critique of those methods and indicators are even less common.

However, considerable material has been identified to show that M&E of livelihoods impacts is taking place using a variety of methods and with a wide range of indicators. The most common sector source of literature was found to relate to food security, particularly within the emergencies sector, e.g. the FAO World Food Programme and NGOs such as ACF International and CARE. Disaster risk reduction and livelihood resilience is another area where there appears to be a growing body of work.

Of the agencies proposed to look at in the ToR, most have been covered with some examples found. Some are not covered (e.g. AU, IPC, OCHA, other donors, 3ie) principally because the general term searches did not return outputs from these agencies. Time was not sufficient to go through each institution in turn. The same is true for those sectors that are under-represented (e.g. migration, urban rural linkages, and urban livelihoods).



SECTION 2

Methods for M&E

State of evidence

This review found literature relating to monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment of project, programmes and strategies. Much of the literature specifically on monitoring relates to food security (mainly in emergencies). However, more broadly, documents on indicators and methodologies are applicable to all aspects of M&E. Reports of findings generally referred to the findings of evaluations or impact assessments.

Stern et al (2012) note that up to now most impact evaluation is based on a narrow range of mainly experimental and statistical methods and designs that are only applicable to a small proportion of DFID's current programme portfolio. This is partially confirmed in the current review. Particularly for larger scale studies, or those conducted by or for multilateral agencies, experimental methods are often described as the 'gold standard' and qualitative methods regarded as complementary to quantitative methods. However, due to the nature of this literature search (focus on livelihoods, cross organisational and search for best practice) many approaches focusing on qualitative and mixed have also been found. Several studies also mention a recent intentional shift towards more methodologically diverse and eclectic approaches to impact evaluation (Stern, 2012; Smith et al. 2011; Barrett et al. 2014).

Challenges often arise with experimental techniques as a result of the lack of baseline data, or a comparable, non-project control group to serve as the counterfactual (Smith et al. 2011, Nelems and Lee 2009). Other concerns that are raised in thinking about M&E methods include timing, cost, institutional responsibility and coordination, participation, and accuracy and reliability of data collection and interpretation. Dealing with attribution of impact to the intervention is a further challenge: measuring outputs and outcomes are relatively easy, but measuring and attributing long term impacts is much harder.

Evaluators are increasingly being challenged to open their minds to a more balanced view of what constitutes rigor and scientific evidence. Triangulation of results from a variety of methods, including qualitative methods, can increase validity and confidence in the findings of an impact evaluation (Furman, 2009; ACF International, 2011). Participatory tools and methods open up greater opportunities for people to express their views, communicate impacts and understand the nature of change. To be truly participatory M&E should involve as many stakeholders as possible, including donors, local government officials, local staff, partners and other NGOs at all stages. The communities in which a project or programme is implemented should have a say in how M&E activities are planned and implemented, as well as in decision-making around M&E findings. This study highlights some innovative methods to M&E in response to calls for use of a wider spectrum of approaches. However, though innovative methodological proposals are often documented, analysis and reflection once they have been "tried and tested" is harder to find.

Overview of approaches

The following section groups methodological approaches from the literature.



Collation of existing data sources

Two sources are based on the collation of existing quantitative data sources. The M&E System for the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) (Benin et al, 2010) is required to collect data at national, regional and continental levels. Therefore, dedicated methods are not outlined, but rather data is collated from existing data sources within relevant Ministries, from national surveys, World Bank, IFPRI, UNDP, universities, etc.

The national level monitoring of programmes funded by GDPRD, FAO and World Bank covers a range of livelihood sectors (food, agriculture, markets, fisheries, forestry, etc.) but looks more at provision of services, and other national level trends, rather than analysing impacts at the household level. The data for M&E are again mainly to be drawn from relevant Ministries who should be collecting these kinds of data (GDPRD, FAO and World Bank, 2008).

Quantitative

Two sources are cited here based entirely on quantitative survey techniques. Helen Keller International (2008) carried out a quantitative longitudinal survey with baseline and end line data, which was conducted to measure change in nutritional status, food consumption patterns and household coping strategies before and after a cash for work intervention implemented by the Chars Livelihood Programme in Bangladesh. The report seeks to identify improvements to address the challenges and failings of the methodology. For example, as project was very short (just 1 month) the seasonal timing of surveys may have affected results as much as the intervention itself.

Benin et al (2007) document an evaluation which used a large quantitative survey of nearly 900 households and 119 farmer groups across 16 districts of Uganda where the programme was operating at the time. It also covered four districts where NAADS had not yet begun operating to control for factors that may have contributed to differing initial conditions among the communities.

Mixed

Four sources detail the use of mixed methods covering both qualitative and quantitative approaches. M&E Guidelines from ACF International (2011) express a preference for mixed methods. They also encourage participatory methods but also recognise (and detail) strengths and weaknesses of such methods. The annexes to this guidance document detail around 25 different methods of data collection.

Three other studies combine quantitative surveys with qualitative interview approaches McIntosh et al (2013) describe collection of baseline data for a market development project under the Chars Livelihoods Programme. Data was collected in two ways. Five service provider baseline surveys took the form of expert-led in-depth interviews with small numbers of respondents from different categories of service provider. The surveys collected a mix of quantitative and qualitative information. In addition, a producer survey provides quantitative data across a substantial number of important indicators. Various appendices detail methods of indicator assessment such as: calculating levels of business knowledge for service providers; methods of calculating profit; or definitions of “significant improvements” in the quality of inputs, services and methods of selling.

A study of the impact of the Chars Livelihoods Programme on the Disaster Resilience of Chars Communities (Barrett et al 2014) employed a household questionnaire survey with a scoring system to analyse the data. Key informant interviews collected qualitative data to help interpret and understand the findings of the survey.



The Participatory Impact Assessment methodology used to assess the impacts of the Pastoralist Livelihood Initiative in Ethiopia combined participatory methods with conventional sampling methods and statistical analysis (Feinstein International Centre, 2007). Results from participatory methods were cross-checked against project process monitoring data. The community members themselves defined impact indicators for matrix scoring of different interventions.

Qualitative

An evaluation of the World Food Programme's NUSAF 2 project, which aims to improve the access of 77,000 moderately food insecure households with labour to income-earning opportunities and better socio-economic services, is characterised by mixture of qualitative methods, supplemented by drawing on past monitoring surveys for quantitative evidence (Gayfer et al, 2012). They use an *appreciative enquiry* approach in discussions with key informants focusing on the positives of the first 15 months of operation. They apply a *theory of change*¹ lens to establish where the core contribution of the programme lay. They also gather *qualitative data* through use of a survey tool and a series of key informant interviews and group discussions. Practical aspects of the methodology are not detailed in the report. Methods proposed in a guideline for monitoring a livelihoods recovery programme in Indonesia are qualitative (Care International Indonesia, 2006). The principal method proposed is household interviews, and PRA (Participatory Rural Appraisal)² tools are suggested for some aspects. The sample size is over 700 and considerable detail is given about sampling methods.


Dorward et al (2005) have produced a guide to indicators and methods for assessing livestock contributions to livelihoods. It is principally based on participatory approaches including discussions with beneficiaries and the use of a range of PRA tools. Observation is the principal method proposed for monitoring indicators in a study of livelihood trends amongst coastal fishing communities of Orissa State (Salgarama, 2006). Some indicators are verified through household interviews, using PRA tools such as seasonal calendars, or through consulting other records such as local health centre data.

Innovative

Few innovative methodologies were found for which evidence of practice and success were also documented. Livelihood Asset Status Tracking (LAST) is a method for tracking changes in the livelihood asset status of a large number of households (Bond, R. et al., 2007). It has been used over eight years in Uganda, South Africa, Sudan, Malawi and five Indian states. An assessment sheet is developed to help enumerators convert a qualitative understanding of a range of locally relevant household situations into a graded centile scale for each of the five livelihood capitals (natural, physical, financial, social, human) on which they base their livelihood strategies. It is a rapid tool because it is used to guide observation and a semi-structured discussion with the householder. A further objective is to combine the analytical

¹ Theory of change is a set of ideas that describes: what the change should be, how a change process occurs, what makes it happen, what has to happen for the intended result/ outcome to be reached, who needs to be involved, whose interests are at stake, and what the result/ outcome of a change process should be. In this methodology, local participation and triangulation are central to validate the answers to M&E questions.

² See <http://ftp.itc.nl/pub/pgis/PGIS%20Articles/The%20use%20and%20abuse%20of%20participatory%20rural%20appraisal%20-%20Cornwall%20Pratt.pdf> for a useful critique of problems and challenges with PRA.



requirements of the project management with the means of assessment that have local meaning. Some challenges including sampling methods, reliability of enumerator scoring, and focus limited to assets.

Strele et al (2006) document a new methodology for participatory impact monitoring based on experience on the FAO Livelihoods Support Programme in Cambodia. This starts with participatory assessment of the livelihood situation followed by an analysis of the livelihood system. Participatory methods and Systems Thinking are combined. The most important factors which determine the livelihood situation are assessed, their interrelations analysed and the most critical factors for the livelihood system identified. In a third step the methodology assesses the effects projects or project interventions have had on the livelihood situation. A simple tool for aggregation of the results is included in the methodological sequence, allowing for the comparison of different project interventions and their effectiveness and efficiency in triggering positive changes of the most critical factors of the complex rural livelihood systems. The nature of the positive changes also emerge from the participatory process and those that are most frequently mentioned are prioritised by the aggregation process.



SECTION 3

Indicators for M&E

State of Evidence

This study has found a wide spectrum of indicator sources and styles depending on size and scale of the associated organisation or programme. Some sources provide broad indicator areas or questions, whilst others are more precise with associated tools and measures. Some sources propose indicators, some suggest how to decide indicators (e.g. based on logframe).

This study has sought indicators under particular sectors likely to have a livelihoods impact (food security, livestock, markets, etc.) and has been successful in most areas. There are, in addition, a number of studies which broadly take the asset framework of the Sustainable Livelihoods Approach as a starting point for identifying indicators of more holistic impact on livelihoods (Twigg, 2007, Salagrama, 2006). Around half the sources report on indicators designed to for the purpose of a specific project M&E process. The other half propose generic sets of indicators to be used across all projects and programmes within an organisation or within a sector or that organisation (ACF International, no date and 2011; Tango International 2004, Chars Livelihood Programme, 2012; Dorward et al., 2005; Twigg, 2007).

Overview of Indicator sources and approaches

The following provides a brief overview of indicator sources and approaches.

ACF International (no date) - Multi sector

ACF have developed a toolkit detailing core and thematic indicators for use across ACF projects. There are 9 thematic areas: agriculture; livestock and fishery; food assistance; cash based interventions; education/training/capacity building; disaster risk management (DRM) & natural resource management; hunger safety net and social protection; income generating activities; and surveillance/early warning system.


An excel document of multiple spreadsheets details indicator descriptions, indicator variables, means of verification, data collection and other remarks. There are 20 to 30 indicators covering impact, outcome, output and process for each thematic area.

Nelems and Lee (2009) (for Oxfam) - Multi sector

A synthesis of livelihoods evaluations between 2006 and 2008 identified a typology of four short to medium term outcomes and eight longer term impacts which, it is proposed, could be used to guide an indicator set to support greater cohesion, sharing and learning between Oxfam GB's diverse livelihoods programmes.

Care International Indonesia (2006) - Multi Sector

Care International Indonesia outline a set of 18 indicators for a post tsunami livelihood recovery programme looking at both outcomes and intermediate effects. The indicators



cover the following areas of livelihoods security: shelter, economic security, WASH, disaster, social networks and gender status. The indicators are drawn from TRIAMS (Tsunami Recovery Impact Assessment and Monitoring System), the Logical Framework, and the CARE Design, Monitoring and Evaluation Guidelines.

Tango International 2004 (for CARE Bangladesh) - Multi sector

A workshop was organized in March 2004 by CARE-Rural Livelihood Program generated a set of comprehensive set of 26 livelihood indicators organized around 9 livelihood outcome themes that meet a number of standard criteria, such as, validity, measurability, relevance and flexibility. The 9 themes are: food security; nutritional security; economic security; shelter and WASH; health; education; gender status; community participation; and access to institutions

Chars Livelihood Programme (2012) - Food security

Indicators for use in Chars Livelihoods Programme Food Security Monitoring
12 indicators under 3 categories: food availability, food access and food utilisation

ACF International (2011) - Food security

6 core indicators for assessing food security to be applied in all Food Security and Livelihoods projects of Action Against Hunger (ACF), include dietary diversity, risk to malnutrition of children and evolution of market prices.

These should be supplemented by ACF-identified thematic indicators depending on the focus of the project. There are 9 thematic areas (see ACF International, no date)

Maxwell, D. and R. Caldwell (2008) – Food Security

Developed by CARE, in collaboration with WPF, TANGO, USAID and the Feinstein Institute, the Coping Strategies Index (CSI) is an indicator of household food security that is relatively simple and quick to use, straightforward to understand, and correlates well with more complex measures of food security. A set of simple questions is developed to capture people's basic consumption-related coping responses to inadequate access to food in a given culture or location. These are assessed along with frequency and severity of behaviour. The frequency of a specific behaviour is weighted by the perceived severity of that behaviour, and this is summed up across all the behaviours in the list that were derived for that location. This index results in a score that reflects current and perceived future food security status.

Chars Livelihoods Programme (2008) - Nutrition


Indicators of nutritional status were used to assess programme changes under a Chars Livelihoods Programme cash-for-work intervention in 2008. These are stunting, underweight, wasting and body mass index. Calculation references are suggested.

Benin, et al. (2007) - Agriculture

Four impact areas (rather than formal indicators) are identified for an impact survey of the National Agricultural Advisory Service (NAADS) in Uganda: adoption and productivity of new technologies and enterprises; awareness and use of improved production practices and new enterprises adopted after 2000; participation of households in the market; and access to advisory services and other institutions.

Benin et al (2010) - Agriculture

The M&E System for the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) is based on a set of indicators grouped into seven intervention areas: (1) enabling environment; (2) implementation process; (3) commitments and investments; (4) agricultural growth performance; (5) agricultural trade performance; (6) poverty, hunger, and food and nutrition security; and (7) investment-growth-poverty linkages. There are around 100



indicators in total and it is expected that the data will come from relevant Ministries, the World Bank, National Surveys and other existing sources.

UNECE (2012) - Agriculture

The Wye Group Handbook is a guide to improving and unifying national level data collection systems, rather than project based M&E. It outlines existing indicators used by the institutions in the group and the sources of data for measurement. These are mainly quantitative survey / census data. Its purpose is to set out principles and pointing to good practice for better data and indicators on the environment, rural economies and communities and the farm household itself.

Njuki, J. (2011) - Livestock

ILRI (International Livestock Research Institute) have identified indicators to monitor the changing role of livestock in livelihoods in different production systems and the impact of livestock-related interventions. There are 6 categories of indicator (livestock ownership; access to, and use of, technologies and services; production and productivity of livestock; labour use in livestock systems; contribution of livestock to incomes; and livestock contribution to household food security). Under each indicator category between 2 and 6 calculated variables have been identified.

Dorward et al (2005) - Livestock

This report details methods for developing indicators for assessing livestock keeping contributions to people's livelihoods. This principally involves using a series of matrices to elicit information about, for example, livestock species owned, their functions, changes over time, and limiting constraints for each species.

Feinstein International Centre (2007) – livestock

In this Participatory Impact Assessment methodology the community members themselves defined impact indicators for matrix scoring of different interventions.

McIntosh et al (2013) - Markets / Livestock

Ten indicators have been identified for Livestock Producer and Service Provider Baseline Surveys for a Market Development Project forming part of the Chars Livelihoods Programme. Examples are: number of households in business groups that have loans for livestock production; percentage average increase in total value of business group's livestock assets; number of households using improved livestock rearing practices.

Salgarama (2006) - Fisheries


The indicators used to assess livelihood trends in coastal fishing communities of Orissa State were of two types: those which referred to general conditions of a village (such as inaccessibility), or of fishing livelihoods (such as excessive capture of juveniles in fish catches); and those which related to specific impacts of poverty at the household level. 44 indicators are suggested for households and 28 for the village level. Though directed at the fisheries sector, these indicators transcend sector and disciplinary boundaries and aim to provide a holistic and integrated picture.

Global Land Tool Network (GLTN) (no date) - Land Rights

The Global Land Indicators Initiative (GLII), at its second meeting held in The Hague, The Netherlands on 8-9 November 2013 proposes four broad indicators for consideration by Member States and stakeholders.

Twigg (2007) - Resilience

John Twigg has documented an extensive set of indicators as part of study to identify the Characteristics of a Disaster Resilient Community, covering five thematic areas: risk management and vulnerability reduction; governance; risk assessment; knowledge and



education; and disaster preparedness and response. The 45 indicators relating to risk management and vulnerability reduction address livelihoods issues in seven areas: environment and natural resource management; health and wellbeing; sustainable livelihoods; social protection; financial instruments; physical protection; and planning regimes.

Barrett et al (2014) - Resilience

An impact evaluation of the Chars Livelihood Programme on disaster resilience drew on Twigg (2007), selecting 14 characteristics of disaster resilience to measure, though focusing on the four thematic areas of governance; risk assessment; knowledge and education; and disaster preparedness and response, and not the area of risk management and vulnerability reduction which is most livelihoods focused.

How gender is dealt with

Gender is raised as an issue in most manuals dealing more broadly with M&E as well as most empirical M&E studies or reports, noting the need for specific efforts to ensure full participation and to understand gendered impacts of projects or programmes. A distinction can be drawn between approaches which promote gender equality and those that actively put women and girls at the forefront of development. Gender disaggregation of data should be carried out as a minimum requirement in M&E, but some approaches actively seek to assess how women and girls are impacted by particular development interventions.

Gender-sensitive indicators are provided for consideration in a number of studies. The ACF International Food Security and Livelihoods Monitoring and Evaluation Guidelines (ACF International, 2011) proposes six indicators of participation; one indicator of access; one indicator of knowledge attitude and practice; and four indicators of benefit, based on CIDA's (1996) Guide to Gender-Sensitive Indicators.

The World Food Programme Food Security Analysis Service in its 2009 guideline for food security and vulnerability analysis outlines key issues to do with gender that should be taken into account in M&E e.g. differing roles and responsibilities, access to assets, power and decision making, and needs and priorities. An illustrative list of four generic, quantitative indicators is suggested that can be used to incorporate gender analysis into food security and vulnerability studies.

Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index developed by IFPRI (2012) measures the roles and extent of women's engagement in the agriculture sector in five domains: (1) decisions about agricultural production, (2) access to and decision making power over productive resources, (3) control over use of income, (4) leadership in the community, and (5) time use.

Gender is fully integrated into all indicators developed by ILRI for its livestock and livelihoods work, for example calculating gender asset disparity, gender livestock ownership by gender, and different gendered roles (Njuki, J. et al. 2011).



SECTION 4

Annotated Bibliography and References

Key

Research Type	Research Design
Primary and Empirical	EXP- Experimental OBS- Observational+ method
Secondary	SR- Systematic Review OR- Other Review
Theoretical and Conceptual	n/a

Reference	Keywords	Summary
Global Land Tool Network (GLTN) (no date) Land rights indicators for the Post-2015 Development Agenda / Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) http://www.gltn.net	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grey literature Theoretical and Conceptual Indicators Land Network 	This one page document summarizes the discussions of the second meeting of Global Land Indicators Initiative (GLII) held in The Hague, The Netherlands on 8-9 November 2013. Secure tenure rights and equitable access to assets like land and natural resources are critical to breaking the cycle of poverty.
McIntosh, R.A. et al (2013) Market Development Project: Findings from the Producer and Service Provider Baseline Surveys. Chars Livelihoods Programme and iDE. http://www.clp-bangladesh.org/pdf/market%20development%20baseline%20report.pdf	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grey literature EXP Indicators Markets / livestock NGO 	The CLP and iDE are implementing a market development project using a Making Markets Work for the Poor (M4P) approach. The Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for the project contains a variety of indicators by which the project's impact may be understood. From December 2012 to January 2013 a baseline was established for the project using a series of surveys. A large scale survey addressed the baseline status of producers in the livestock sector on the Chars, while five small surveys addressed the baseline status of five distinct groups of service providers in the sector. These surveys collected quantitative data on many of the indicators outlined in the Framework.
Chars Livelihood Programme (2012) Review of the CLP's Approach to	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grey literature Theoretical and 	This short (3 page) report reviews changes in CLP's approach to monitoring food security. Up until June 2012, food security project were monitored around just three



Reference	Keywords	Summary
Monitoring Food Security.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conceptual Indicators Food Security 3pp 	food access indicators. A review of CLP's approach undertaken between April and June 2012, revealed the need to widen the remit to include food availability and food utilisation as highlighted at the 1996 World Food Summit.
<p>Chars Livelihoods Programme (2008) Report on measuring change in nutritional status and coping strategies in response to monga of the Chars Livelihoods Programme (CLP) cash-for-work intervention. Prepared by Helen Keller International, October 2008</p> <p>http://www.clp-bangladesh.org/pdf/nutritional%20status%20and%20cfw.pdf</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grey literature Primary and Empirical (EXP) Indicators Nutrition Donor / NGO 	<p>'Monga' is a Bangla term which reflects acute food deprivation and is often experienced in the northern region of Bangladesh. During 2006 <i>monga</i> the Chars Livelihoods Programme (CLP) introduced some labour intensive 'cash-for-work (CFW)' interventions in Gaibandha and Kurigram. Helen Keller International (HKI) conducted research to measure change in nutritional status, food consumption patterns and households coping strategies to mitigate the effect of <i>monga</i>. A quantitative longitudinal survey was conducted in Gaibandha and Kurigram two northwestern districts of Bangladesh. Indicators of nutritional status were used to assess programme changes.</p>
<p>Barrett, A. et al. (2014) Impact of the Chars Livelihoods Programme on the Disaster Resilience of Chars Communities, Chars Livelihood Programme, Innovation, Monitoring and Learning Division, January 2014</p> <p>http://www.clp-bangladesh.org/pdf/impact%20of%20clp%20on%20the%20disaster%20resilience%20of%20char%20communities%20%5Bfinal%5D.pdf</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grey literature Primary and Empirical - EXP Secondary (OR) Methods Resilience Donor 53pp 	<p>The project addresses livelihoods and strengthens resilience through infrastructure improvements, asset transfers (cattle), social development (meetings, training), disaster relief, and building financial capital (savings and loans schemes).</p> <p>The methodology for this study used a mixed methods approach. Quantitative data was collected using questionnaires and then a score card was created. Key Informant Interviews were performed to collect qualitative data to understand the findings of the survey. Questionnaires were based on Disaster Resilient characteristics created by John Twigg (see below), and covered four main themes that make up a disaster-resilient community: Disaster Preparedness and response; Knowledge and Education; Risk Assessment; and Governance. The household questionnaire and scoring system are included in document Annexes.</p>
<p>Twigg, J. (2007) Characteristics of a Disaster-resilient Community A Guidance Note. Version 1 (for testing). DFID Disaster Risk Reduction Interagency Coordination Group, August 2007</p> <p>www.practicalaction.org/docs/ia1/communitiy-characteristics-en-lowres.pdf</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grey literature Theoretical and Conceptual Secondary (OR) Indicators Resilience Donor / NGO 	<p>This guidance note is for government and civil society organisations working on disaster risk reduction (DRR) initiatives at community level, in partnership with vulnerable communities. It shows what a 'disaster-resilient community' might consist of, by setting out the many different elements of resilience. It also provides some ideas about how to progress towards resilience.</p>
<p>Maxwell, D. and R. Caldwell (2008) The Coping Strategies Index: A tool for rapid</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grey literature Theoretical and 	<p>It contains extensive tables of indicators of a disaster resilient community covering five thematic areas: governance, risk assessment, knowledge and education, risk management and vulnerability reduction, and disaster preparedness and response</p> <p>Measuring food insecurity is a costly and complicated exercise. In highly food insecure countries operational agencies need regular measurements for monitoring</p>



Reference	Keywords	Summary
<p>measurement of household food security and the impact of food aid programs in humanitarian emergencies Field Methods Manual 2nd Edition, CARE, Feinstein International Center, Tufts University, TANGO International, WFP, USAID, http://www.wfp.org/content/coping-strategies-index-field-methods-manual-2nd-edition</p> <p>Care International Indonesia (2006) Household Livelihoods Security Monitoring System, Beudoh Livelihoods Recovery Programme Monitoring and Evaluation. Technical Assistance Unit, Banda Aceh, Indonesia, July 2006 http://pgdl.care.org/CuttingEdge/HLS%20Monitoring%20System.pdf</p> <p>TANGO International, Inc. (2004) Measuring Livelihood Impacts: A Review of Livelihoods Indicators. Livelihood Monitoring Unit (LMU) Rural Livelihoods Program CARE Bangladesh, March 2004. http://portals.wi.wur.nl/files/docs/ppme/LMP_Indicators.pdf</p> <p>World Food Programme (2008) Food consumption analysis Calculation and use of the food consumption score in food security analysis. Prepared by VAM unit HQ Rome. Version 1, February 2008, WFP Rome.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conceptual Secondary (OR) Methods indicators Food Security NGO <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grey literature Theoretical and Conceptual Secondary (OR) Methods Indicators Cross sectoral NGO 35pp <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grey literature Theoretical and Conceptual Secondary (OR) Indicators Multi sector NGO 22pp <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grey literature Theoretical and Conceptual Secondary (OR) Methods Food Security 	<p>changes and for assessing the impact of food aid interventions. Often these interventions take place in emergency conditions. Time is limited, and field conditions do not permit lengthy and intensive data collection or analysis processes. Tools are needed that are quick and easy to administer, straight-forward to analyse, and rapid enough to provide real-time information to program managers. The Coping Strategies Index (CSI) is one such tool. It was developed in Uganda, Ghana, and Kenya but has now been used for early warning and food security monitoring and assessment in at least nine other African countries and several in the Middle East and Asia.</p> <p>Beudoh is a Livelihood Recovery Programme of Care International Indonesia for the tsunami affected population of Aceh Province. This HLS monitoring system was developed to monitor the progress and impact of the programme through key livelihood indicators that it envisages to impact on over its life time. Three approaches for indicator selection were adopted: 1) chosen from TRIAMS (Tsunami Recovery Impact Assessment and Monitoring System); 2) chosen from the Logical Framework; 3) selected from the CARE Design, Monitoring and Evaluation Guidelines. Indicators are identified for outcomes and for intermediate effects. Tools used to measure the indicators are qualitative, including PRA and household interviews. Detail is given about sampling methods.</p> <p>A workshop was organized in March 2004 by CARE-Rural Livelihood Program to review and assess the "competing" Livelihood indicators already in use by CARE, other donors and local NGOs to monitor changes in livelihoods. This report is the outcome of review and assessment of the current livelihood indicators used with in CARE and also by other external organizations. The report gives details of the process involved in building a consensus and generating a set of best proxies as Livelihood indicators. It also describes a finite and comprehensive set of indicators (26 livelihood indicators, organized around 9 livelihood outcome themes) that meet a number of standard criteria, such as, validity, measurability, relevance and flexibility. The 9 themes are: food security; nutritional security; economic security; shelter and watsan; health; education; gender status; community participation; and access to institutions.</p> <p>Analysis of food security by WFP generally uses food consumption as the entry point. Food consumption measured in kilocalories is the gold standard for measuring consumption, and often considered to be one of the gold standards for food security- but the collection of detailed food intake data is difficult and time consuming. The Food Consumption Score (FCS) is a composite score based on dietary diversity, food frequency, and relative nutritional importance of different food</p>



Reference	Keywords	Summary
http://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/manual_guide_proced/wfp197216.pdf ACF International (2011) Food Security and Livelihood Monitoring and Evaluation Guidelines: A Practical Guide for Fieldworkers, October 2011, ACF International http://www.actionagainsthunger.org/publication/food-security-and-livelihoods-monitoring-and-evaluation-guidelines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UN • Grey literature • Theoretical and Conceptual • Indicators • Food Security • NGO • 222pp 	<p>groups. The construction of this score is based on a standardized and transparent methodology.</p> <p>This guide explains terminology, offers guidance on purpose, sequencing, beneficiary involvement, strategies, tools and methodologies. However it is not fully grounded in concrete examples from practice.</p> <p>ACF has six core indicators that give an overview of the factors affecting household FSL and ultimately malnutrition. These are mandatory across all FSL projects. Besides these, a list of optional thematic FSL indicators have been created covering 9 themes, with process, output, outcome and impact indicators.</p> <p>Selecting from a predetermined list of indicators facilitates standardisation and harmonisation across projects, while also allowing flexibility to adapt them to be context-specific. Gender sensitive indicators are proposed. Representation of all groups, HIV and the environment are also cross cutting issues.</p>
ACF International (no date) Toolkit 3: ACF Core and Thematic Indicator Framework. ACF International Not available online	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grey literature • Theoretical and Conceptual • Indicators • Multi sector • NGO 	<p>This is an excel spreadsheet detailing the core indicators and thematic indicators covering the 9 themes of: agriculture interventions, including horticulture, agriculture and agro forestry; livestock and fishery interventions; food assistance; cash based interventions; education/training/capacity building interventions; disaster risk management (DRM) & natural resource management; hunger safety net and social protection interventions; income generating activities; and surveillance/early warning system interventions. There are indicators for measuring process, output, outcome and impact, indicator variables, means of verification etc.</p>
Benin, S. et al. (2007) Assessing the Impact of the National Agricultural Advisory Services (NAADS) in the Uganda Rural Livelihoods. IFPRI Discussion Paper 00724, October 2007 http://dspace.cigilibrary.org/jspui/bitstream/123456789/31938/1/IFPRI%20Discussion%20Paper%2000724.pdf	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grey literature • Primary and Empirical - EXP • Methods • Agriculture • Research • 92pp 	<p>The report details a large survey of nearly 900 household and 119 farmer groups across 14 districts of Uganda to assess the impact of the NAADS. Tools used were quantitative: household survey and farmer group survey. The data collected from the household survey included: adoption and productivity of new technologies and enterprises; awareness and use of improved production practices and new enterprises adopted after 2000; participation of households in the market; and access to advisory services and other institutions.</p> <p>The farmer group survey collected data related to empowerment of farmers to organize, to demand and manage advisory services and how advisory services of different types have influenced livelihoods of female and male farmers, as well as actual access of group members to advisory services, their participation in development of institutions and their perception of the quality and availability of</p>



Reference	Keywords	Summary
<p>Gayfer, J. et al (2012) Formative evaluation of World Food Programme's Livelihoods Programme, Karamoja, Uganda, IOD PARC, Sheffield, July 2012 https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/204624/WFP-livelihoods-prog-Karamoja-Uganda.pdf</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grey literature • Primary and Empirical – EXP / OBS • Secondary - OR • Methods • Food security • Agriculture • UN • 91pp 	<p>advisory services. Survey tools are annexed to the report</p> <p>The goal of NUSAF 2 (WFP) I is to improve the access of 77,000 moderately food insecure households with labour capacity (approximately 50% of the population in the Karamoja sub-region) to income-earning opportunities and better socio-economic services. This evaluation is characterised by mixed qualitative and quantitative methods.</p>
<p>GDPRD, FAO and World Bank, (2008) Tracking results in agriculture and rural development in less-than-ideal conditions. A sourcebook of indicators for monitoring and evaluation. GDPRD, FAO and World Bank http://www.fao.org/docrep/011/i0380e/i0380e00.htm</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grey literature • Theoretical and Conceptual • Secondary - OR • Methods • Indicators • Multi sector • GDPRD, FAO, WB 	<p>This report looks at national level monitoring of programmes funded by GDPRD, FAO and World Bank. It covers a range of livelihood sectors (food, agriculture, markets, fisheries, forestry, etc.) but is looking more at provision of services, and other national level trends rather than analysing impacts at the household level. There is a table of 86 short and long term impact indicators with details of why they are important and data sources. The data to monitor or evaluate them are mainly to be drawn from relevant Ministries who should be collecting these kinds of data.</p>
<p>Benin, S. et al (2010) Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) System for the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) ReSAKSS Working Paper No. 6. March 2010. http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/eufao-fsi4dm/doc-training/CAADP_ME_system_hendricks.pdf</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grey literature • Theoretical and Conceptual • Methods • Indicators • Multi sector • UN 	<p>This document outlines the framework to be used in monitoring progress towards the successful implementation of CAADP to support mutual, peer and progress reviews at the continental, regional and national levels, respectively, and to provide a conceptual basis for impact assessment of CAADP.</p> <p>Indicators are grouped into seven intervention areas: (1) enabling environment; (2) implementation process; (3) commitments and investments; (4) agricultural growth performance; (5) agricultural trade performance; (6) poverty, hunger, and food and nutrition security; and (7) investment-growth-poverty linkages. The responsibility for collecting, cleaning and managing the data on the above indicators lies with the country itself. Sources tend to be national level Ministries who would be collating such information as a matter of course.</p>
<p>Njuki, J. et al. (2011) Gender, Livestock and Livelihood Indicators. ILRI, October 2011, http://cgspace.cgiar.org/bitstream/handle/10568/3036/Gender%20Livestock%20and%20Livelihood%20Indicators.pdf</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grey literature • Theoretical and Conceptual • Secondary - OR • Indicators • Methods 	<p>This guide is a reference point for some of the important indicators that ILRI use to monitor the changing role of livestock in livelihoods in different production systems and the impact of livestock-related interventions. In deriving these indicators, the sustainable livelihoods framework has been used, placing livestock within an assets and capital framework, and as a pathway out of poverty. The document identifies 6 categories of indicators and gives a rationale for each of the indicators and how to</p>



Reference	Keywords	Summary
<p>Dorward A., et al. (2005) A guide to indicators and methods for assessing the contribution of livestock keeping to the livelihoods of the poor. Imperial College London / Livestock Production Programme www.ilri.org/html/Guide16Dec.pdf</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Livestock / Gender • Research • 40pp • Grey literature • Theoretical and Conceptual • Indicators • Methods • Livestock • Research • 37pp 	<p>measure them covering both the tools for data collection on the indicators and their calculation.</p> <p>This guide outlines methods and indicators for assessing the contribution of livestock keeping to livelihoods of poor people. The indicators and methods can be used in: appraisal of possible developments of new technology in research projects; prioritisation and design of potential changes and interventions to improve the livelihoods of poor livestock keepers; ongoing participatory monitoring and evaluation of projects seeking to improve the livelihoods of poor livestock keepers; and retrospective assessment of the impact of changes in livestock keeping on livelihoods</p> <p>The report suggests different approaches to developing indicators and collecting information. These principally involve developing matrices (e.g. species of animal and function) and completing tables in discussion with livestock keepers / project beneficiaries. Principles for participatory investigation are described and additional PRA tools are suggested.</p>
<p>Stern, E. et al (2012) Broadening the range of designs and methods for impact evaluations. Report of a study commissioned by the Department for International Development, April 2012, DFID Working Paper 38, https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/35007/design-method-impact-eval.pdf</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grey literature • Theoretical and Conceptual • Methods • Cross sector • Donor • 127pp 	<p>Up to now most investment in impact evaluation has gone into a narrow range of mainly experimental and statistical methods and designs that, according to the study's Terms of Reference, DFID has found are only applicable to a small proportion of their current programme portfolio. This study is intended to broaden that range and open up complex and difficult to evaluate programmes to the possibility of IE.</p> <p>Having reviewed the literature on quality in research and evaluation, the study concluded that a common framework could be applied across different designs and methods. Standards such as validity, reliability, rigour and transparency have therefore been incorporated into a three part QA framework covering: the conduct of the evaluation; the technical quality of methods used and normative aspects appropriate to IE in an international development setting.</p>
<p>Salagrama, V. (2006) Trends in poverty and livelihoods in coastal fishing communities of Orissa State, India. FAO Fisheries Technical Paper. No. 490. FAO, Rome. ftp://ftp.fao.org/docrep/fao/009/a0692e/a0692e00.pdf</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grey literature • Theoretical and Conceptual • Secondary - SR • Methods • Fisheries / multi • FAO 	<p>The purpose of this study was to analyse trends that have impacted the lives and livelihoods of different stakeholders in the coastal fishing communities of Orissa State, in terms of poverty, food insecurity and vulnerability, and to develop simple indicators and a methodology to monitor them over time.</p> <p>The indicators were of two types: those which referred to general conditions of a village (such as inaccessibility), or of fishing livelihoods (such as excessive capture</p>



Reference	Keywords	Summary
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 130pp 	of juveniles in fish catches); and those which related to specific impacts of poverty at the household level. Though directed at the fisheries sector, these indicators transcend sectoral and disciplinary boundaries and aim to provide a holistic and integrated picture.
Bond, R. et al (2007) Monitoring the Livelihood Platform: reflections on the operation of the Livelihood Asset-Status Tracking method from India and Malawi. Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal, Volume 25, Issue 4, p.301-315 http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.3152/146155107X269058	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peer reviewed Primary and Empirical – EXP / OBS Secondary - SR Indicators Methods Academic 16pp 	The Livelihood Asset-Status Tracking method was developed for monitoring the livelihood platform of households in large livelihood projects. It uses a locally developed assessment sheet describing the range of household situations for each of five livelihood capitals (natural, physical, human, financial and social). This facilitates the rapid conversion of a judgement by the enumerator into a centile score. After six years of operation in India and Africa, the paper evaluates the utility, and reliability of the method as well as some emerging issues. It discusses how the method might be further developed. Initial operational results seem very promising but caution is required in the application of a method based on calibrated judgement.
Nelems, R. and R. Lee (2009) Evaluation Synthesis: Livelihoods Evaluations 2006-2008 Outcomes and lessons learned from Oxfam GB's livelihoods programme evaluations. May 2009, Oxfam GB, Oxford http://oxfamlibrary.openrepository.com/oxfam/bitstream/10546/119471/1/er-synthesis-livelihoods-programme-010509-en.pdf	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grey literature Secondary - SR Indicators Multi sector NGO 52pp 	<p>This report synthesises the results and lessons learned in 40 evaluations of Oxfam GB's Sustainable Livelihoods programmes in the calendar years 2006 to 2008. There is not much focus on the evaluation methods or indicators used apart from noting that evaluators defined, described and framed outcomes in very different ways. To some extent, this diversity reflects the rich range of outcomes to which Oxfam GB's work is contributing as well as the unavoidably subjective nature of evaluation processes. Oxfam GB adheres to a de-centralised approach to evaluation and to date, there is no single typology of results or a comprehensive set of outcome categories identified at the corporate level – from which the evaluators could draw.</p> <p>The report concludes that the development of a typology of impacts, such as one proposed in the report, could support greater cohesion, sharing and learning between Oxfam GB's diverse livelihoods programmes.</p>
World Food Programme Food Security Analysis Service (2009) Comprehensive Food Security & Vulnerability Analysis (CFSVA) Guidelines, WFP, Rome http://www.wfp.org/content/comprehensiv-e-food-security-and-vulnerability-analysis-cfsva-guidelines-first-edition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Theoretical and Conceptual Indicators, Food Security, Baseline, FAO 200+ pages 	<p>The Comprehensive Food Security & Vulnerability Analysis (CFSVA) is a tool designed to understand and describe the profiles of food-insecure and vulnerable households, identify the root causes of hunger, and analyse the risks and emerging vulnerabilities among populations in crisis-prone countries. It also makes recommendations on the best response options (food or non-food) to reduce hunger, target the neediest and informing preparedness. It is a baseline survey for ongoing monitoring. The Food and Nutrition Security Conceptual Framework is based on UNICEF's Nutrition Framework and the (DFID) Sustainable Livelihoods Framework.</p>



Reference	Keywords	Summary
<p>Strele, M et al (2006) Participatory Livelihoods Monitoring Linking Programmes and Poor People's Interests to Policies Experiences from Cambodia. FAO Livelihood Support Programme Working Paper 21 Participation, Policy and Local Governance Sub-Programme, FAO, Rome</p> <p>ftp://ftp.fao.org/docrep/fao/009/ah455e/ah455e00.pdf</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grey literature • Primary and Empirical – EXP / OBS • Methods • Cross sectoral • FAO • 46pp 	<p>This report documents a new methodology was developed to allow for participatory impact monitoring. This new methodology starts with participatory assessment of the livelihood situation. In a second step the livelihood system is also analysed. Participatory methods and methods of Systems Thinking are combined. The most important factors, which determine the livelihood situation are assessed, their interrelations analysed and the most critical factors for the livelihood system identified. In a third step the methodology assesses the effects, certain projects or project interventions have on the changes of the livelihood situation. A special focus lies on the crucial factors and how they are influenced by the project intervention.</p> <p>A simple tool for aggregation of the results is included in the methodological sequence, allowing for the comparison of different project interventions and their effectiveness and efficiency in triggering positive changes of the most critical factors of the complex rural livelihood systems.</p> <p>The method was tested in eight villages in Cambodia and the results have the potential to help steer project interventions towards achieving the desirable results and impacts.</p>
<p>UNECE (2007) The Wye Group Handbook: Rural Households Livelihood and Well-Being. Statistics on Rural Development and Agriculture Household Income. UNECE, FAO, OECD, The World Bank, and Eurostat.</p> <p>http://economia.unipv.it/pagp/pagine_per_sonali/msassi/int/publicazioni/9.0%2520Complete%2520Publication.pdf</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grey literature • Secondary - OR • Indicators • Methods • Agriculture • Donor • 549pp 	<p>This Handbook acknowledges the need for better data and indicators on the environment, rural economies and communities, and, very importantly, the farm household itself which in almost all countries is the most numerous type of farm unit. It helps fill this major information gap by setting out principles and pointing to good practice.</p> <p>The document is principally talking about national level data collection systems, rather than project based M&E. It outlines existing indicators used by the institutions in the group and the sources of data for measurement. These are mainly quantitative survey / census data.</p>
<p>IFPRI (2012) Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index. International Food Policy Research Institute, Washington DC, USA</p> <p>http://feedthefuture.gov/sites/default/files/resource/files/weai_brochure_2012.pdf</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grey literature • Secondary - OR • Indicators • Gender • Agriculture • Donor • 20 pp 	<p>The Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index (WEAI) measures the empowerment, agency, and inclusion of women in the agriculture sector in an effort to identify ways to overcome those obstacles and constraints. It measures the roles and extent of women's engagement in the agriculture sector in five domains: (1) decisions about agricultural production, (2) access to and decision making power over productive resources, (3) control over use of income, (4) leadership in the community, and (5) time use. It also measures women's empowerment relative to men within their households. Data for the index is collected through a household survey interviewing men and women from the same household. The report details</p>



Reference	Keywords	Summary
<p>Feinstein International Center (2007) Impact Assessments of Livelihoods-based Drought Interventions in Moyale and Dire Woredas A Pastoralist Livelihoods Initiative report produced by the Feinstein International Center in partnership with: CARE, Save the Children, USAID Ethiopia, Feinstein International Center, Tufts University www.alnap.org/pool/files/849.pdf</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grey literature • Primary – EXP • Methods • Livestock • Emergencies • Academic / NGO / Donor • 58pp 	<p>the findings of pilot surveys in Bangladesh, Guatemala and Uganda. Ultimately, the Index will be used for performance monitoring and impact evaluations of USAID's Feed the Future programs.</p> <p>This report documents the impacts of livelihoods interventions forming part of the Pastoralist Livelihoods Initiative in Ethiopia. The impact assessments combined descriptions of project activities (sometimes called 'process monitoring') with the systematic use of participatory methods to capture local perceptions of benefits. The report details the findings of two case studies.</p>



References

- Furman, R. (2009) Theory of change M&E system in the Livelihoods and Landscapes Strategy initiative (draft version) Forest Conservation Programme IUCN Gland AEA Conference, Orlando, November 2009
- Smith, L. et al. (2011) Admissible Evidence in the Court of Development Evaluation? The Impact of CARE's SHOUHARDO Project on Child Stunting in Bangladesh, IDS Working Paper, Volume 2011, Number 376
- Turrall, S. and K. Studd (2009) Capturing Change in People's Lives and Livelihoods within Programmes. Learning from Good Practice and Experiences of Conservation Development Organisations to inform WWF practice. Consultancy Report, June 2009