Monitoring & Evaluation Framework for KNOWFOR

Prepared for the United Kingdom Department for International Development (DFID) by Clear Horizon Pty Ltd.
Contact details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clear Horizon Contact</th>
<th>Client contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jess Dart</td>
<td>Julien Colomer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Director</td>
<td>Evaluation and Impact Assessment Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Horizon Consulting</td>
<td>Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129 Chestnut St, Cremorne VIC 3121</td>
<td>Jalan CIFOR, Situ Gede, Bogor Barat 16115, Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P: (03) 9425 7777</td>
<td>P: +62 251 8622 070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: <a href="mailto:jess@clearhorizon.com.au">jess@clearhorizon.com.au</a></td>
<td>E: <a href="mailto:j.colomer@cgiar.org">j.colomer@cgiar.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Document review and authorisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Date distributed</th>
<th>Issued to:</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draft 1</td>
<td>16/05/2014</td>
<td>Gaia Allison (DFID)</td>
<td>Draft 1 to be reviewed by DFID and all partners. Draft 2 to be sent for review 04/06/2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Julien Colomer (CIFOR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel Miller (PROFOR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Miguel Calmon (IUCN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chetan Kumar (IUCN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft 2</td>
<td>4/06/2014</td>
<td>Gaia Allison (DFID)</td>
<td>Draft 2 to be reviewed by DFID and all partners. Final draft to be circulated following the review workshop on June 12th – 13th.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Julien Colomer (CIFOR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel Miller (PROFOR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Miguel Calmon (IUCN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chetan Kumar (IUCN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL DRAFT</td>
<td>30/06/2014</td>
<td>Gaia Allison (DFID)</td>
<td>Draft 3 is the final draft of M&amp;E framework worked on by consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Julien Colomer (CIFOR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel Miller (PROFOR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Miguel Calmon (IUCN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chetan Kumar (IUCN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Director | Jess Dart
Internal Contributors | Bethany Davies, Stuart Raetz, Jill Campbell, Megan Roberts
External Contributors | Rick Davies, Andrew Rixon
Last saved | 26/08/2014 12:03 PM
Clear Horizon Reference Number | CH13_191

Disclaimer

This document has been produced with information supplied to Clear Horizon by DFID and KNOWFOR partners (IUCN, PROFOR and CIFOR) in the form of programme documents and during consultation visits and participatory workshops. While we make every effort to ensure the accuracy of the information contained in this report, any judgements as to suitability of the information for the client’s purposes are the client’s responsibility. Clear Horizon extends no warranties and assumes no responsibility as to the suitability of this information or for the consequences of its use.
Contents

1. Executive Summary .................................................................................................................. 7

2. Introduction and background .................................................................................................. 12
  2.1. About this document ........................................................................................................... 12
  2.2. About KNOWFOR ............................................................................................................ 12
  2.3. Why this framework was needed ..................................................................................... 13
  2.4. Challenges for KNOWFOR M&E Framework ................................................................. 14
  2.5. Approach to M&E ............................................................................................................. 14
  2.6. Components of the M&E Framework ............................................................................... 16

3. KNOWFOR Theory of Change: What is our programme aiming to achieve and how? ....... 18
  3.1. Overview of Theory of Change ........................................................................................ 18
  KNOWFOR Partner Intermediaries and standardised outputs .............................................. 22

4. Scope and objectives of the M&E framework: Why do we want M&E? ............................. 26
  4.1. Purpose .......................................................................................................................... 26
  4.2. Audience ........................................................................................................................ 26
  4.3. Which parts of KNOWFOR should the M&E be focused on? ........................................ 27

5. Key evaluation questions: What do we want to know about KNOWFOR? ....................... 29

6. Performance expectations: What are we expecting to achieve? .......................................... 31
  6.1. Rubrics .......................................................................................................................... 31
  6.2. Targets .......................................................................................................................... 32
  6.3. Logframe ....................................................................................................................... 33
  6.4. KNOWFOR baseline ..................................................................................................... 35

7. Answering KNOWFOR Evaluation Questions: What data will we collect to answer our evaluation questions? ................................................................................................. 37
  7.1. Data Collection ............................................................................................................... 40
  7.2. Synthesis ........................................................................................................................ 43

8. Evaluation: What is the data telling us? .............................................................................. 45
  8.1. Bringing the data together to make programme wide evaluative reflection .................... 45
  8.2. Independent end of programme evaluation .................................................................... 46

9. Using M&E ............................................................................................................................ 50
  9.1. Utilising M&E information ............................................................................................. 50
  9.2. Reporting ......................................................................................................................... 50

Attachment 1: IUCN M&E plan ................................................................................................. 52
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment 2: CIFOR M&amp;E plan</th>
<th>60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key evaluation questions</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory of change</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection tools</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilisation</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIFOR M&amp;E Summary Table</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment 3: PROFOR M&amp;E Plan</th>
<th>68</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key evaluation Questions</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory of Change</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection Tools</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilisation Strategies</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFOR M&amp;E Plan Summary Table</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment 4: KNOWFOR Rubrics</th>
<th>79</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theory of Change Level 1.2: Effective design at the project level</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory of Change Level 1.2: Project design across the organisation</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory of Change Level 2: Uptake at the project level</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory of Change Level 2: Uptake at the organisational level</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance at the KNOWFOR LEVEL</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines for using rubrics</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Attachment 5: M&E Toolkit     | 84 |

| Attachment 6: Glossary and key terms | 85 |
List of figures

Figure 1 KNOWFOR M&E System ................................................................. 12
Figure 2 Simplified KNOWFOR Theory of Change Model .................................. 13
Figure 3 Components of the M&E framework.................................................... 16
Figure 4 Simplified KNOWFOR Theory of Change Model .................................. 19
Figure 5 Actor centred theory of change .......................................................... 22
Figure 6 KNOWFOR Theory of Change and areas of M&E Focus ............................. 27
Figure 7 Use of rubrics at different organisational levels ...................................... 32

List of tables

Table 2 Theory of change structure .................................................................. 18
Table 3 KNOWFOR Intermediary functional roles ............................................. 24
Table 4 KNOWFOR M&E Audience information .............................................. 26
Table 5 Key Evaluation Questions .................................................................... 29
Table 6 KNOWFOR Logframe Summary Table ................................................ 35
Table 7 KNOWFOR M&E Framework Summary Table ................................................................. 38

Table 8 Scaling KNOWFOR M&E framework implementation .................................................. 44

Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIFOR</td>
<td>Center for International Forestry Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>United Kingdom Department for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUCN</td>
<td>International Union for Conservation of Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEQ</td>
<td>Key Evaluation Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNOWFOR</td>
<td>Improving the way knowledge on forests is understood and used internationally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEF</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFOR</td>
<td>Program on Forests</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Executive Summary

This document presents the overarching monitoring and evaluation (M&E) framework for the DFID funded programme named “Improving the way knowledge on forests is understood and used internationally” (KNOWFOR). It is overarching as it provides the conceptual basis for how we will monitor and evaluate KNOWFOR. It is complemented by three nested M&E plans for each of the KNOWFOR partners: Centre for International Forestry Research (CIFOR), the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) and the World Bank Program of Forests (PROFOR) as well as a guidance note for DFID programme managers on the synthesis of programme wide M&E data.

KNOWFOR aims to fill a gap between the supply and uptake of knowledge by practitioners and decision makers in the forestry sector by improving the pathways for disseminating research and other knowledge products, tools, capacity building activities and advice to policy makers and forestry and land-use practitioners.

The M&E approach aims to address several challenges posed by monitoring knowledge sharing, uptake and use while applying best practice M&E approaches. It adopts a participatory approach, based around intended use and users. Making use of nested M&E plans, it aims to aggregate key measures across partner organisations, yet offer flexibility. It aims to gain clarity about the theory of change for each partner, places a focus on unpacking relationships through which knowledge travels, and adopts a contribution analysis approach to understanding causality.

The primary purpose of this overarching KNOWFOR M&E is to:

- provide an evidence based account of the programme wide achievements of KNOWFOR
- demonstrate how KNOWFOR moved the partner organisations beyond business as usual
- tell the story of the value that was added by bringing the partners together.

The primary audience for the M&E products are the KNOWFOR programme managers (both DFID and partners) and DFID’s senior management.

KNOWFOR theory of change

DFID KNOWFOR has an identified programme outcome of having Policymakers and Practitioners in developing countries equipped with strategic knowledge, comparable evidence, reliable tools and systematic analysis on forests, trees and climate. This will contribute to broader impacts on poverty reduction, biodiversity conservation, protection of climate and other ecosystem services through improved management of forests and trees. In order to achieve the end of programme outcome, each of the KNOWFOR partners have a combination of direct and indirect relationships with targeted policy makers and practitioners. Each partner is making a contribution to the achievement of the KNOWFOR end of programme outcomes. While the activities, intermediaries and end users of the partners overlap and are not mutually exclusive, there are clearly different areas of focus and strength in each partner’s operations.

The core focus of the monitoring and evaluation efforts is on:

1. The effective project design processes that facilitate KNOWFOR partners to plan for and effectively reach targeted policy makers and practitioners.
2. What knowledge products and dissemination events are being delivered
3. The extent to which targeted intermediaries, policy makers and practitioners were equipped with knowledge and information as the result of KNOWFOR’s efforts.

These areas of focus are elaborated by the key evaluation questions. Drawing on Hovland (2007) these questions address the key areas of programme interest: management, outputs, uptake and outcomes/impacts of KNOWFOR:

- How well has the management and delivery of KNOWFOR supported research uptake?
- How adequate was the quality, reach, volume and relevance of KNOWFOR knowledge products and engagement processes?
- To what extent and how did KNOWFOR equip forestry related practitioners and policy makers?
- What outcomes if any, did KNOWFOR contribute to?
- How have changes in forestry practice influenced poverty reduction, biodiversity conservation and climate impact in developing countries?

To answer the key evaluation question partners will draw on the data collected through both existing methods or tracking systems and a sub-set of common new tools. The KNOWFOR Monitoring and Evaluation Toolkit includes the following:

- Influence log
- Episode study template
- Promising Practice Profiles (PPPs)
- Network mapping
- Event evaluations (Part 1 – 3)
- Trip report template
- Semi-structured interviews
- Vignettes
- Digital media tracking
- Output log
- Citation analysis and content analysis
- Other relevant existing partner data collection or tracking systems.

The relationship between these data collection tools, the key evaluation questions, performance benchmarks and key indicators is summarised in Table 1 below.

**Programme Wide Reporting**

DFID carries ultimate responsibility for compiling information from the three KNOWFOR partners into a format that conveys a convincing and compelling, programme wide narrative. In order to facilitate this KNOWFOR partners will make use of standardised output and intermediary knowledge user classifications, common qualitative rubrics and performance targets in their annual reporting documents. DFID programme managers will then use these outputs to complete the KNOWFOR logframe and track progress and performance at the aggregate level. A summary of the logframe and key indicators in provided in Table 2 below.
Table 1 KNOWFOR M&E Framework Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ToC Level</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Key Evaluation Question</th>
<th>Performance Benchmark</th>
<th>Key Indicators</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Level 4. Longer term impacts** | Poverty reduction, biodiversity conservation, protection of climate and other ecosystem services through improved management of forests and trees. | KEQ 5 How have changes in forestry practice influenced poverty reduction, biodiversity conservation and climate impact in developing countries? | N/A | Not necessarily attributable indicators:  
- Poverty levels amongst poor forest dependent households [CONTRIBUTION]  
- Area of degraded forest landscapes restored in developing countries [CONTRIBUTION]  
- Area of deforestation [CONTRIBUTION]  
- Amount of equivalent tonnes of carbon emissions from avoided deforestation and carbon sequestration from restored forest [CONTRIBUTION] | • Externally commissioned secondary data (may include impact evaluations, international monitoring of social, economic and environmental trends) |
| **Level 3. Shorter term impacts** | Improvements in forestry related policy and practice | KEQ4 What outcomes, if any, did KNOWFOR contribute to? | N/A | N/A | • Influence log  
- Trip reports  
- Vignettes |
| **Level 2. Programme Outcomes** | Policymakers/practitioners in developing countries are equipped with strategic knowledge, comparable evidence, reliable tools and systematic analysis on forests, trees and climate. | KEQ3 To what extent and how did KNOWFOR equip forestry related practitioners and policy makers? | Rubric: Uptake | KNOWFOR partners reach acceptable level of influence against the “uptake rubric” (based on an aggregation of project level results) at 2016 | • Episode study  
- Vignettes  
- Influence log  
- Trip report  
- Performance Story Report |
| | Intermediaries promote, share and disseminate KNOWFOR products to policy makers and practitioners | KEQ3a. 3.a. To what extent and how did KNOWFOR influence KNOWFOR intermediaries? | | | • Event tools  
- Social media  
- Influence log  
- Output log  
- Vignettes  
- PPPs  
- Trip report |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>KNOWFOR partners generate targeted forest and tree related knowledge products (gender disaggregated)</th>
<th>KEQ2</th>
<th>How adequate was the quality, reach, volume and relevance of KNOWFOR knowledge products and engagement processes?</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Enabling outputs</th>
<th>KEQ 1: How well has the management and delivery of KNOWFOR supported research uptake?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Outputs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• # of knowledge products and range of categories (of which at least 25% either explicitly respond to the specific needs of women and girls or generates sex differentiated knowledge)</td>
<td>Output log</td>
<td>• Evidence based self-assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• # and range of KNOWFOR supported engagement process/events (workshops, forums, meetings etc.)</td>
<td>Event tools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• # and type of products accessed (downloads, distributed etc)</td>
<td>Semi-structured interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• # of participants at KNOWFOR supported events/ processes (disaggregated by gender).</td>
<td>SNA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>KNOWFOR partners have improved understanding of their audiences and knowledge uptake pathways.</td>
<td>KEQ 1a</td>
<td>To what extent are systems and processes in place to plan for and foster research uptake in KNOWFOR?</td>
<td>Rubric: Effective project design</td>
<td>KNOWFOR partners reach acceptable level of influence against the KNOWFOR effective project design rubric on understanding of uptake pathways at 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• # of interactions where partners planned activities for mutual benefit or a common purpose</td>
<td>Evidence based self-assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• # of joint events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• # of jointly developed products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Improved collaboration across KNOWFOR partners.</td>
<td>KEQ 1b</td>
<td>To what extent has research uptake been influenced by collaboration and partnership between KNOWFOR partners?</td>
<td>Collaboration Target</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• # of interactions where partners planned activities for mutual benefit or a common purpose</td>
<td>Output log</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• # of joint events</td>
<td>PPPs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• # of jointly developed products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 KNOWFOR Logframe Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Longer term impact</th>
<th>Longer term impact indicator 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Poverty reduction, biodiversity conservation, protection of climate and other ecosystem services through improved management of forests and trees. | Instances of improvement at a localised scale that KNOWFOR has contributed towards:  
- Poverty levels amongst poor forest dependent households  
- Area of degraded forest landscapes restored in developing countries  
- Area of deforestation  
- Amount of equivalent tonnes of carbon emissions from avoided deforestation and carbon sequestration from restored forest |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shorter term impact</th>
<th>Shorter term impact indicator 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvements in forestry related policy and practice</td>
<td>Instances of change in policies or practice in targeted areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme outcome</th>
<th>Programme outcome indicator 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intermediaries and policymakers/practitioners in developing countries are equipped with strategic knowledge, comparable evidence, reliable tools and systematic analysis on forests, trees and climate.</td>
<td>KNOWFOR is rated as ‘Meeting expectations’ or ‘Above expectations’ in the ‘Uptake’ rubric for Level Three (policymakers and practitioners) at 2016.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output 1.1</th>
<th>Output indicator 1.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KNOWFOR partners generate targeted forest and tree related knowledge products (gender disaggregated)</td>
<td># of knowledge products and range of categories (of which at least 25% either explicitly respond to the specific needs of women and girls or generates sex differentiated knowledge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output indicator 1.2</strong></td>
<td># and range of KNOWFOR supported engagement process/events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output indicator 1.3</strong></td>
<td># and type of products accessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output indicator 1.4</strong></td>
<td># of participants at KNOWFOR supported events/ processes (disaggregated by gender)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output 1.2</th>
<th>Output indicator 1.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KNOWFOR partners have improved understanding of their knowledge of their target audiences and uptake pathways and use those pathways more effectively.</td>
<td>KNOWFOR is rated as ‘Meeting expectations’ or ‘Above expectations’ in the ‘Effective project design’ rubric for Level One at 2016 (rubric includes criteria such as whether project planning included identification of next users and knowledge pathway and the differentiated needs of women and girls)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 1.3 indicator 1.1</strong></td>
<td># of interactions where partners planned activities for mutual benefit or a common purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 1.3 indicator 1.2</strong></td>
<td># of joint events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 1.3 indicator 1.3</strong></td>
<td># of jointly developed products</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Introduction and background

2.1. About this document

This document presents the overarching monitoring and evaluation (M&E) framework for the United Kingdom Department for International Development (DFID) funded programme named “Improving the way knowledge on forests is understood and used internationally” (KNOWFOR). We call it overarching as it provides the conceptual basis for how we will monitor and evaluate KNOWFOR which is a partnership of three diverse organisations. The partners are the Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR); the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) and the World Bank Program of Forests (PROFOR). Under this framework are nested partner-specific plans and supporting tools which collectively form the monitoring and evaluation system. The components that sit under this overarching framework are:

- an M&E toolkit, from which each partner organisation can draw
- an M&E operational plan for each partner organisations
- A guide for DFID to aggregate the data across the three partner organisations and assess the performance of the programme as a whole.

This is shown visually in Figure 1.

![Figure 1 KNOWFOR M&E System](image)

2.2. About KNOWFOR

While there is considerable research and a well developed knowledge base on forests, trees and land-use, there is still a gap between the supply and uptake of knowledge by practitioners and decision makers in the forestry sector. KNOWFOR seeks to address this gap between research and practice by improving the pathways for disseminating knowledge products, tools and advice to policy makers and forestry and land-use practitioners. More specifically, KNOWFOR seeks to
equip policy makers and practitioners in developing countries with strategic knowledge, comparable evidence, reliable tools and systematic analysis on forests and climate. Figure 2 illustrates the basic theory of change model for the KNOWFOR programme, showing how the partners work directly and indirectly to equip decision makers (policy makers and practitioners) with the knowledge to implement changes in policy and practice.

Figure 2 Simplified KNOWFOR Theory of Change Model

The programme makes a high level assumption that there is added value in bringing together three diverse partner organisations who all work (albeit in different ways) towards greater uptake of knowledge by practitioners and decision makers in forest related sectors. The assumed benefits are that cross-organisational learning will occur, which will lead to sharing of lessons learned, greater efficiency and effectiveness and leverage.

2.3. Why this framework was needed

The first annual review for KNOWFOR was undertaken in July 2013. The review recommended the development of an M&E system capable of providing evidence of knowledge uptake and
influence in forest related sectors as the result of KNOWFOR. Further, the review stressed that KNOWFOR’s audience have a central role to play in the programme monitoring and evaluation.

While each of KNOWFOR’s three partners is constituted differently and works in different ways with different actors, there is a requirement for DFID to tell a cohesive narrative regarding the achievements of their investment through KNOWFOR as a whole. This includes both aggregating results across the three organisations to tell a programme level performance story, as well as to show the value of bringing the three partners together.

2.4. Challenges for KNOWFOR M&E Framework

There are two main types of challenges faced in developing this M&E framework. Firstly, there are challenges associated with collecting data that can provide a cohesive story across three diverse organisations, each with their own language and systems of describing activities and outcomes. Secondly, there are challenges inherent in attempting to monitor and evaluate programmes that try to influence policy and practice through knowledge generation – these include issues of attribution, issues associated with the relational nature of how change occurs and the long timeframes often involved. These latter challenges are explored more fully in the KNOWFOR White Paper (Attachment 7) that accompanies this framework.

2.5. Approach to M&E

In order to address the challenges and incorporate best practice principles, this M&E framework adopts a number of different approaches including:

- A participatory approach to develop the M&E framework
- A utilisation-focused approach
- A structure that uses nested implementation plans to enable aggregation of key measures, while providing flexibility across the three partner organisations
- A programme wide theory of change
- Social network analysis (SNA) to understand the relational networks through which knowledge and information travels
- A focus on understanding contribution rather than proving attribution
- A mixed-method approach.

To ensure applicability across all three partner organisations, this framework was developed through a participatory approach involving key KNOWFOR partner representatives and the DFID programme manager. This framework takes a pragmatic approach centred on the intended uses and users of the M&E framework. Within the field of M&E this approach is referred to as a ‘utilisation-focused’ evaluation (UFE) approach whereby the information needs of the stakeholders involved in KNOWFOR have provided a basis for the development of the M&E system. Developed by Michael Quinn Patton1, the guiding principle of this approach is that M&E should be planned and conducted in a way that is most useful to those that will use evaluation outputs. The adoption of a UFE approach has informed the: (i) identification of evaluation audiences and their information needs; and (ii) subsequent decisions about the evaluation

---

process. UFE also advocates a question based approach, as reflected by the use of key evaluation questions in this M&E framework.

In order to address issues associated with aggregating across three diverse organisations, a nested approach to M&E has been adopted. The conceptual framework offers the following elements to enable horizontal reporting:

- a set of high level key evaluation questions
- a programme level logframe with a set of performance standards with which to judge the effectiveness of the programme
- a common way to describe and aggregate outputs and actors across the three organisations
- a M&E tool kit of monitoring and evaluation tools which can be used by partners where appropriate.

While the above strategies enable us to gather data across all organisations to tell a common story, it is also important to allow sufficient flexibility in the framework to ensure that it is meaningful and useful to each organisation. To this end the framework includes a tailored monitoring and evaluation plan that nests under this framework for each partner organisation. For the partner level M&E plans, flexibility is ensured by:

- having an organisational, and more detailed logic model for each partner
- having the flexibility to tailor sub-evaluation questions for each partner organisation
- M&E tools from which partners can pick and choose methods to meet their needs and complement tools that are already in place.

Each partner-specific plan will reflect the operational aspects of the partners’ work and will use a selection of common data collection tools.

A targeted review of relevant literature suggests that when conducting M&E on knowledge uptake and influence programmes it is important to understand the theory of change, the relational networks within and between actors and be clear about how contribution or attribution will be assessed. This M&E framework includes an overarching theory of change for the whole KNOWFOR programme, as well as nested theory of change models for each partner organisation. It also seeks to understand the relational networks through which knowledge and information travels and is disseminated. For this reason, this framework adopts both a people-centred approach to understanding the cause and effect relations within our theory of change, and also includes social network mapping as a tool for monitoring the reach of knowledge uptake. With regard to attribution and contribution, the approach taken is to accept that establishing contribution to change is more realistic, cost-effective and practical than seeking to establish attribution. In light of this and in acknowledgement of the fact that disentangling the impact of KNOWFOR from other influences is challenging, the proposed evaluation approach draws on “contribution analysis” as developed by John Mayne (1999). Mayne suggests that in some programmes we need to accept the fact that what we are doing is measuring with the aim of reducing the uncertainty about the contribution made, rather than proving attribution.
2.6. Components of the M&E Framework

The KNOWFOR M&E system is structured by a number of key guiding constructs. Each of the core components of the M&E framework have been informed by consultations with KNOWFOR partners and DFID programme managers. Figure 3 illustrates the different components of the M&E framework, and offers a set of simple questions that corresponds to each component. These questions are used throughout the document to help orient the reader and provide a roadmap.

Figure 3 Components of the M&E framework

**Section 3** presents the detailed theory of change for the KNOWFOR programme, in other words it describes what our programme is aiming to achieve and how. The theory of change describes the general mechanisms through which KNOWFOR is seeking to influence forest related policies and practices. This section also presents the common outputs and intermediary groups that will facilitate us to tell a programme wide performance story.

**Section 4** provides the scope and objectives of the M&E framework, it address the question “Why do we want M&E”. It outlines the primary purpose for developing the M&E framework, describes the key people whose information needs the framework seeks to address and lays out the elements of the KNOWFOR programme that the M&E will focus upon.
Section 5 introduces the key questions that the KNOWFOR M&E framework will address – in other words it addresses the question “What do we want to know about KNOWFOR?”. These are carefully crafted questions that crystallise what DFID and the KNOWFOR partners would like to know about the management, outputs, uptake and outcomes/impacts of KNOWFOR. These questions and the supporting sub-questions will determine the direction for the programme’s M&E inquiry and determine the type of information that needs to be collected.

Section 6 describes the approach to assessing programme performance expectations; that is ‘what are we expecting to achieve?’. It provides the programme wide logical framework and the benchmarks used to articulate what ‘success’ looks like. It also provides an overview of the approach to collecting the baseline.

Section 7 provides a detailed overview of the types of data that will be collected to address the key evaluation questions as well as tools used to collate and synthesise data.

Section 8 describes the points at which the collected partner level monitoring and evaluation data will be brought together to make programme wide evaluative judgements. In other words it explains how to make sense of the data and evaluate performance. It also points to where independent evaluations may occur.

Section 9 describes how KNOWFOR partners and DFID will use the information collected through the KNOWFOR M&E framework. It also provides an outline of the key reporting requirements that the framework needs to support.

Section 10 of the M&E Framework presents a directory for the supporting M&E materials. In other words how we will use M&E. Attachments provided are:

1. KNOWFOR Partner M&E Implementation plan: IUCN
2. KNOWFOR Partner M&E Implementation plan: CIFOR
3. KNOWFOR Partner M&E Implementation plan: PROFOR
4. Rubrics and guidance notes
5. KNOWFOR M&E Toolkit
6. Glossary and key terms
7. KNOWFOR White Paper
8. DFID Guide
9. Project Manager User Guide
10. DFID logframe
3. KNOWFOR Theory of Change: What is our programme aiming to achieve and how?

3.1. Overview of Theory of Change

Theory of change (ToC) is a thinking tool that is used to clarify how outcomes are achieved, articulate a clear narrative for the intervention and assist monitoring and reporting on project progress.

A ToC was developed for the KNOWFOR programme through a participatory process involving inputs from KNOWFOR partners and programme documentation.

The ToC is structured according to a series of levels that are outlined in Table 2 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1 Theory of change structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broader goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End-of-programme outcomes (EOPOs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outputs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A simplified theory of change model for KNOWFOR has been developed in consultation with partners and is presented in Figure 4 below. KNOWFOR has an identified programme outcome of having Policymakers and Practitioners in developing countries equipped with strategic knowledge, comparable evidence, reliable tools and systematic analysis on forests, trees and climate. This will contribute to broader impacts on poverty reduction, biodiversity conservation, protection of climate and other ecosystem services through improved management of forests and trees.
In order to achieve the end of program outcome, each of the KNOWFOR partners has a combination of direct and indirect relationships with targeted policy makers and practitioners (Level 2 in Figure 4). As illustrated in Figure 4, where a direct relationship exists the partners may have direct contact or interaction with policy makers or forestry practitioners. In other instances, these direct relationships may not exist, meaning that KNOWFOR partners work through a network of intermediaries (NGOs, research institutes, bilateral and multilateral agencies, private sector, World Bank offices etc) to ensure that policy makers and practitioners are equipped with the knowledge and information needed. Intermediaries in the KNOWFOR M&E framework is a general term that is used to describe those stakeholders that KNOWFOR partners interact and/or collaborate/partner to reach their ultimate end users.2

In addition, KNOWFOR partners are all undertaking work internally in order to identify appropriate intermediaries and end users, inform their engagement approach and plan for maximum impact from their knowledge generation work (Level 1 in Figure 4). This work informs the pathways

2 End users in KNOWFOR are defined as the ultimate target groups named in the end of program outcome – i.e. policy makers and practitioners in developing countries. These are the target groups that KNOWFOR partners are attempting to equip with knowledge through the intermediaries identified in the KNOWFOR theory of change.
through which KNOWFOR partners will reach end users (e.g. through which intermediaries and using what medium or process).

Each partner is making a contribution to the achievement of the KNOWFOR end of programme outcomes. While the activities, intermediaries and end users of the partners overlap and are not mutually exclusive, there are clearly different areas of focus and strength in each partner’s operations.

**PROFOR contribution to KNOWFOR Theory of Change**

In relation to the achievement of KNOWFOR’s programme outcome, PROFOR’s major focus is on providing targeted policy advice to reform-minded technical departments in governments at national, subnational and local levels. This reflects the strategic advantage PROFOR has in being positioned within the World Bank with close engagement with regional operations teams and a range of other networks and communities of practice. There is also a focus on influencing the private sector’s policies and processes through engaging with small and medium enterprises as well as large-scale foreign direct investors.

**CIFOR contribution to KNOWFOR Theory of Change**

CIFOR has a focus on generating international public goods through high quality, timely research and relevant place based knowledge. In addition a range of KNOWFOR funded activities seek to influence the forest related research agenda and provide civil society with skills and networks to engage in dialogue with state-based and private sector forestry actors.

**IUCN contribution to KNOWFOR Theory of Change**

IUCN’s contribution to the achievement of KNOWFOR’s programme outcome comes through its focus on equipping two different sets of actors with relevant knowledge and tools to support their contribution to Forest Landscape Restoration (FLR). The focus of their efforts is on ensuring that:

- National and sub-national practitioners (including private sector) have access to knowledge and tools to implement FLR
- Global, regional, national and sub-national policy-makers and organisations are equipped with knowledge and tools to facilitate FLR implementation

For a more detailed Theory of Change for each partner, please refer to the nested partner M&E plans please refer to Attachment 1 – 3.

**The value of collaboration through KNOWFOR**

The value of KNOWFOR is however greater than the sum of the individual contributions that each partner makes to equipping specific target audiences with appropriate knowledge products. The programme also hopes to see a range of other outcomes resulting from the partnership, including:

- KNOWFOR partners improving the relevance quality and useability of KNOWFOR and non-KNOWFOR forest related knowledge products by sharing their specific skills, expertise, connections and resources
• the partnership become an influential voice in discussions that are framing the future directions of the forest sector by engaging collectively on key issues of shared interest (e.g. the discussions around Sustainable Development Goals)
• improvements in the partner’s internal knowledge uptake planning and M&E systems and potentially in their broader donor/partner community’s systems as well.

A more detailed theory of change for how collaboration between KNOWFOR partners results in greater influence on forestry related knowledge intermediaries and policy makers/practitioners will be developed in KNOWFOR Phase 2.
3.2. KNOWFOR Partner Intermediaries and standardised outputs

As noted above each partner works in different ways and through similar but distinct networks of intermediaries. To facilitate programme wide reporting under these circumstance, common classifications have been developed for:

1. partner outputs
2. intermediary organisation types and functional roles.

These common classifications will enable DFID to tell a unified story across the KNOWFOR programme relating to scale of programme output (Level 1) and reach through intermediary groups (Level 2). Figure 6 elaborates on the simplified KNOWFOR theory of change model presented in Figure 4 and includes the standard outputs (1.1) and intermediary groups.

Figure 5 Actor centred theory of change

1. Standardised partner outputs

KNOWFOR partner outputs have been classified into two broad categories with supporting subcategories that reflect the different types of activities that partners undertake. These categories are a) knowledge products and b) engagement processes.
**Knowledge products**

Among other activities, KNOWFOR partners are all involved in the generation (or co-generation) of tangible knowledge translation products. These products are diverse and cover specific place-based pieces of analysis as well as broader spectrum products such as policy briefs, reports, scientific articles, web-based tools, methodologies or publically accessible communication products and information databases. Agreed general terms for KNOWFOR knowledge products are:

- **Tailored communication products**
  - e.g. policy briefs, blogs, notes from the field, project videos

- **Tested conceptual frameworks, tools and methodologies**
  - frameworks, assessment processes, diagnostic tools, research methodologies (e.g. Framework for Assessing and Monitoring Forest Governance; Options Assessment Framework for benefit sharing, Forest Connect: Supporting Small and Medium Forest Enterprises toolkit, Assessing Forest Governance: A Practical Guide to Data Collection, Analysis and Use; Forest Sector Public Expenditure Reviews Toolkit)

- **Analytics and databases**
  - ISI journal paper, working paper, book, book chapter, data sets, commissioned place based/issue based pieces of analysis (e.g. Impacts of Climate Change on Rural Landscapes in Brazil, Drivers of deforestation in the Congo basin, Using Forests to Enhance Resilience to Climate Change (analytics/reports); World Bank forests database)

**Engagement processes**

In addition to tangible knowledge products, KNOWFOR partners lead, support, participate in and facilitate a range of events, processes and dialogues that aim to strategically engage relevant stakeholders in thinking through key forest related issues with the appropriate group of peers or sector specialists. Agreed common engagement processes include:

- **Forest events and forums**
  - e.g. Forests Asia conference, Global Landscape Forum

- **Knowledge and networking platforms**
  - e.g. websites, knowledge hubs, communities of practice, policy dialogue

- **Capacity building opportunities**
  - e.g. exchange visits, training workshops, awareness raising sessions

Partners will use these classifications to track outputs using monitoring templates. In conjunction with the intermediary groupings and functional roles described below these standard outputs will enable KNOWFOR to describe the breadth and diversity of approaches to knowledge uptake and dissemination.

**2. Intermediary groups and functional roles**

The KNOWFOR M&E framework classifies intermediaries in two ways; firstly by **organisational type** and secondly by the **functional role** that they play in relation to a given activity. KNOWFOR intermediaries are often engaged at different points in the creation and dissemination of knowledge products depending on the strategy adopted by partners during the activity planning
stages (refer to Figure 2). Thus an intermediary organisation may play more than one functional role in relation to KNOWFOR at different points of time and in different projects or KNOWFOR funded initiatives.

Common KNOWFOR intermediary organisational types can be broadly clustered into four groups; national, sub-national and local actors, international development actors, initiative and implementation partners and private sector actors and peak bodies.

National, sub-national and local actors:
- Communities and landholders
- Extension workers and technicians
- Government officials.

International development actors:
- Multilateral and bilateral donors, funders and supporters
- Multi-stakeholder initiatives and forums
- International development partners/agencies.

Implementation partners:
- KNOWFOR partner regional offices and personnel
- Civil Society
- Champions and Ambassadors.

Private sector actors and peak bodies:
- Global trade and business forums
- Private industries (SME and international corporations).

In order to represent the diverse ways in which KNOWFOR partners engage with the types of intermediary groups identified above, a simple range of functional groupings have been developed in collaboration with KNOWFOR partners. KNOWFOR intermediary functional roles are outlined below in Table 2.

Table 2 KNOWFOR Intermediary functional roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description of what that intermediary does</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge co-generator</td>
<td>A partner in developing knowledge products or trialling/implementing tools (e.g. policy makers who collaborate on the production of toolkits, research partners etc).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge conduit</td>
<td>Primarily acts as a conduit, facilitating access to information/knowledge products for a wide range of stakeholders, without specific targets or intended outcomes (e.g people who re-tweet, re-post, host forest knowledge content or otherwise disseminate partner’s knowledge products).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge broker</td>
<td>Primarily acts to strategically link specific knowledge users with knowledge products. This may also involve adapting products for specific contexts or aggregating/compiling information for use by specific target users.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

groups (e.g. intermediaries who adapt toolkits to use in specific contexts, NGOs who host networking events with other sector actors etc).
4. **Scope and objectives of the M&E framework: Why do we want M&E?**

4.1. **Purpose**

The primary purpose of this overarching KNOWFOR M&E framework is to provide a conceptual basis for monitoring and evaluating KNOWFOR at a programme level. It should enable us to:

- provide an evidence based account of the programme wide achievements of KNOWFOR
- demonstrate how KNOWFOR moved the partner organisations beyond business as usual
- tell the story of the value that was added by bringing the partners together.

Meanwhile, a secondary, purpose of the KNOWFOR M&E framework is to:

- trial M&E tools and processes that may be applicable to other whole of government investments in knowledge uptake or related existing and new CIFOR-PROFOR-IUCN initiatives.

4.2. **Audience**

The audience for the overarching KNOWFOR M&E framework is presented in Table 3 below. To summarise, the primary stakeholders who will require information from M&E outputs expressly for decision-making purposes include the DFID and KNOWFOR partner programme managers as well as senior management within DFID. Other additional stakeholders that will have an interest in KNOWFOR M&E outputs are also highlighted. However, unlike primary stakeholders, they will not directly use M&E information for decision-making and this M&E framework (while taking into account the accessibility needs of these groups) has not been tailored to meet their information needs.

**Table 3 KNOWFOR M&E Audience information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Information requirements</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DFID Programme Managers</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Evidence based story of change Programme successes and challenges</td>
<td>Annual Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNOWFOR Partner Programme Managers</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Evidence based story of change Actionable management information</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID Senior Management</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Evidence based story of change Value for money</td>
<td>Annual Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNOWFOR Partner Senior Manager</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Evidence based story of change Programme successes and challenges</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole of government partners</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Broader learning Robust and accessible M&amp;E methodology</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other knowledge uptake programme managers</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Broader learning Robust and accessible M&amp;E methodology</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3. Which parts of KNOWFOR should the M&E be focused on?

Key to clarifying the scope of the KNOWFOR M&E is agreeing on which level of outcomes the programme is responsible for within the programme’s timeframe. By focusing on the agreed end of programme outcome (Policymakers/ practitioners in developing countries are equipped with strategic knowledge, comparable evidence, reliable tools and systematic analysis on forests, trees and climate) it is apparent that the focus of the monitoring and evaluation efforts should be on:

1. The effective project design processes that facilitate KNOWFOR partners to plan for and effectively reach targeted policy makers and practitioners.
2. What knowledge products and dissemination events are being delivered
3. The extent to which targeted intermediaries, policy makers and practitioners were equipped with knowledge and information as the result of KNOWFOR’s efforts.

Figure 7 illustrates the levels of the theory of change on which the KNOWFOR M&E framework will focus. Level 1 (1.1 – 1.3) and Level 2 (intermediaries and end users) are within scope while the ultimate impacts of KNOWFOR’s work (Level 3, short term impacts and Level 4, long term impacts) are beyond the scope of this framework.

![Figure 6 KNOWFOR Theory of Change and areas of M&E Focus](image-url)
Rationale for M&E focus

According to the programme theory of change, the likelihood of successfully equipping target end users with appropriate information is maximised by careful consideration of the ultimate audience for information, the networks in which they are embedded, the intermediaries they are connected with and the engagement strategies that are most likely to be appropriate for a given audience. In order to test this theory, or understand the contribution that this effective project design work makes to the successful provision of information to end users, focused M&E at Level 1.2 is vital. As mentioned in Section 2.2 the programme makes the assumption that there is an advantage in bringing these three complimentary organisations (CIFOR, PROFOR, IUCN) together to maximise knowledge uptake in forest related sectors. Therefore, a key focus of the M&E needs to be on capturing the additional value that the partnership between the three organisations has delivered (Level 1.3). This secondary focus of the programme will be reflected in the monitoring tools included in the partner level plans, the programme wide indicators included in the logframe and the suggested impact evaluation studies.

The theory of change also predicts that at times the most effective way of delivering knowledge and information to policy makers and practitioners will be through networks of trusted intermediary groups. To test this KNOWFOR needs to understand the mechanisms through which knowledge and information are transmitted (both direct and indirect) and the processes that support successful uptake. Data collection tools and monitoring processes in the framework will seek to collect the relevant information to tell this story.

The framework will also establish monitoring tools to quantify the extent to which targeted policy makers and practitioners access and use knowledge and information. This information will demonstrate the scale of achievement facilitated by work conducted at Level 1 of the theory of change. As part of this story, also of interest is the extent to which DFID is being influenced by the knowledge produced by KNOWFOR partners. There are compelling examples of how KNOWFOR supported initiatives have influenced changes in policy and DFID’s own programmes are drawing on products to develop the rationale for other programme concept notes. These need to be captured and become part of the KNOWFOR story.

The outcomes or impacts that result from policymakers and practitioners having the knowledge or information (such as changes in Level 3 and 4 of Figure 7) are of interest in telling the story of KNOWFOR. However, rather than investing in systematically demonstrating attribution to KNOWFOR at the impact level, information at this level will be collected in a light manner, focusing on the point of investment and utilising vignettes and reporting on relevant externally monitored trends (for more detail refer to Section 2.1:Theory of Change and Section 4: Data Collection).
5. Key evaluation questions: What do we want to know about KNOWFOR?

The following Key Evaluation Questions (KEQs) have been identified for KNOWFOR. KEQs will structure and inform all monitoring and evaluation activities at a programme level and drawing on Hovland (2007) address four key areas of interest: management, outputs, uptake and outcomes/impacts of KNOWFOR.

Table 4 Key Evaluation Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key evaluation questions (KEQs)</th>
<th>Evaluation sub-questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How well has the management and delivery of KNOWFOR supported knowledge uptake?</td>
<td>1.a. To what extent are systems and processes in place to plan for and foster knowledge uptake in KNOWFOR?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.b. To what extent has knowledge uptake been influenced by collaboration and partnership between KNOWFOR proponents (CIFOR, IUCN and PROFOR)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How adequate was the relevance, quality, reach, volume and relevance of KNOWFOR knowledge products and engagement processes?</td>
<td>2.a. What outputs were delivered through KNOWFOR?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.b. To what extent did KNOWFOR knowledge products meet partner standards and expectations for quality?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.c. How adequate was the reach of KNOWFOR?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.d. Was the volume of knowledge products sufficient in order to influence uptake by target audiences?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.e. Were the knowledge products relevant and targeted to requirements of users appropriately?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To what extent and how did KNOWFOR equip forestry related practitioners and policy makers?</td>
<td>3.a. To what extent and how did KNOWFOR influence KNOWFOR intermediaries?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.b. To what extent and how did forest related decision-makers (policy-makers and practitioners) become more equipped with strategic knowledge, comparable evidence, reliable tools and systematic analysis on forests trees and climate as a result of KNOWFOR?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What outcomes, if any, did KNOWFOR contribute to?</td>
<td>4.a. How were KNOWFOR products/processes used?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.b. What evidence exists of KNOWFOR products interfacing with the policy process in target areas?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.c. What outcomes in policy or practice (positive and negative) occurred as a result KNOWFOR knowledge?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How have changes in forestry practice influenced poverty reduction, biodiversity conservation and climate impact in developing countries?</td>
<td>5.a. What instances of localised impact did KNOWFOR contribute towards?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.b. What were the broader changes in forestry practices and policies in developing countries?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These KEQs will be addressed at the programme level (encompassing the work of all three partners). These KEQs will provide a basis for annual reporting. Sub-evaluation questions can be adapted to suit each partner’s context in partner level M&E plans (see Attachment 1-3).

KEQs play several roles in this framework. As well as crystallising what we most want to know from M&E and guiding data collection, they also provide a structure against which reporting can occur.
**Telling a gender differentiated story through KNOWFOR M&E**

KNOWFOR has an interest in encouraging and telling the story of best practice in relation to gender sensitive research design and knowledge uptake practices. Understanding the implications that gender and gender roles have on how people receive and interact with knowledge or information, as well as the opportunities that they have for accessing it, is a key aspect of understanding target audiences and up-take pathways. As such, the story of how KNOWFOR is working to address the different needs of women and men needs to be captured as part of project team’s reporting on planning, implementation and outcomes.

In acknowledgement of the emphasis that key audiences for the M&E framework place on gendered impacts of funded activities, and in recognition of the continuing need to draw focus and attention the differentiated development outcomes experienced by men and women, the M&E framework has explicitly focused on gender at all levels of the framework. Efforts to tell a gender differentiated story through KNOWFOR M&E includes:

- Explicitly including good practice in gender differentiated planning at the project design stage as a quality assessment criteria for programme design processes (i.e. KNOWFOR effective project design rubric)
- Setting targets in relation to on the number of knowledge products/engagement processes that either explicitly respond to the specific needs of women and girls or generates sex differentiated knowledge
- Requiring sex disaggregated tracking of participation in knowledge production and dissemination activities.
6. Performance expectations: What are we expecting to achieve?

Performance expectations are used in monitoring and evaluation to provide standards to judge and track the success (or otherwise) of an activity over time. They describe “what does success look like”. Performance expectations include metrics such as key performance indicators (KPIs), targets, progress markers and rubrics that are used to describe a benchmark by which to determine whether something is of sufficient value or quality. These benchmarks describe the magnitude of change expected as well as the timeframe within which they are expected to be reached.

The KNOWFOR framework makes use of two types of performance benchmarks to demonstrate progress: rubrics and targets. These benchmarks are both used at different levels in the KNOWFOR logframe.

6.1. Rubrics

‘Rubrics’ are scales that have been used in this framework to provide an evaluative description of what programme performance will “look like” (Davidson, 2005: 247). Rubrics provide a transparent way of assessing programme performance by pre-defining criteria for determining effectiveness. Developed in consultation with KNOWFOR partners and informed by the KNOWFOR White Paper looking into evidence-based policy and practice (Clear Horizon, 2014), three separate rubrics have been developed for KNOWFOR:

- Uptake by intermediaries and policy-makers/practitioners (Level 2)
- Effective project design: (considering uptake, gender and M&E at Level 1)
- Overall programme assessment by DFID.

The rubrics will be applied at the project, organisation and programme level as illustrated by Figure 8.
For full details on KNOWFOR rubrics and guidance on the use of these, please refer to Attachment 4.

6.2. Targets

Targets are an expression of performance expectations which are generally quantitative. Targets are concrete statements specifying what is to be accomplished over a time period. They can be used to either a) predict what is realistically hoped to be achieved or b) be set at a “stretch” to encourage programmes to excel. A predictive target is generally most suited for measurement of programme performance at the output level.

The KNOWFOR framework sets targets in relation to programme wide outputs (Level 1.1). Making use of the standardised output categories described in Section 3.2 the KNOWFOR logframe sets targets in relation to the total:

---

- # of knowledge products and range of categories (of which at least 25% either explicitly respond to the specific needs of women and girls or generates sex differentiated knowledge)
- # and range of KNOWFOR supported engagement process/events (workshops, forums, meetings etc.)
- # and type of products accessed (downloads, distributed etc)
- # of participants at KNOWFOR supported events/processes (disaggregated by gender).

Additionally, targets are set in relation to collaboration (Level 1.3). In this area the programme is interested in seeing an increase in:

- # of interactions where partners planned activities for mutual benefit or a common purpose (e.g. KNOWFOR partnership planning meetings, cross-institute management meetings discussing shared systems or joint opportunities, cross-institute meetings to discuss current or future shared work)
- # of joint events (e.g. events where partners bi-laterally or multi-laterally co-developed or co-delivered content, events that were jointly hosted or funded by at least two partners. NB does not include events where partners were all present but had no specific shared agenda)
- # of jointly developed products (e.g. co-authored publications, jointly developed tools or methodologies, peer reviews of each other’s work).

These targets were negotiated with partners and are intended to motivate engagement in partnership dialogue and explore the extent of programme synergies, making them more a predictive than a stretch target.

6.3. Logframe

DFID asks all programmes to have a logframe and uses this as the primary tool for project description and monitoring. The logframe essentially provides a summary of the M&E framework in tabular format. It includes the key outputs, outcomes and impact that the programme aims to deliver, as well as providing verifiable indicators, benchmarks for what would constitute success as well as some key assumptions.

The KNOWFOR logframe is required to tell the story across the whole programme. In order to do this the logframe sets benchmarks using aggregated qualitative scales (the rubrics discussed above in Section 6.2), as well as output targets using the standard output descriptions. The full DFID logframe can be found in Attachment 10.

---

5 It should be noted there is some duplication between Theory of Change and logframes. Often a Theory of Change replaces the logframe. Theory of Change essentially expands out the thinking around Column 1 of the logframe, focusing not only on the outcomes but also on the causal relationships between outcomes. A logframe can summarise a Theory of Change but provides less detail around how changes is expected to occur. Articulating a Theory of Change can strengthen a logframe. In KNOWFOR we use the Theory of Change to strengthen the logframe, the two frameworks however are consistent.
KNOWFOR logframe overview

The KNOWFOR logframe addresses impact, outcomes and outputs in the following ways:

- **Impact** identifies the broader development objectives (e.g. reductions in poverty, improved protection biodiversity etc) that KNOWFOR will contribute to. At this level the logframe identifies shorter term (changes in policy and practice) and longer term (improvements in social and environmental outcomes) impacts. The identified indicators at this level will be not necessarily attributable to KNOWFORs work but will be used to illustrate the broader changes that are occurring across the sector as the result of combined efforts.

- **Outcomes** identifies the highest level of outcome that KNOWFOR M&E will seek to demonstrate their contribution to. It is set at a level that partners can realistically achieve and influence within the given timeframe. Indicators at this level make use of a rubric relating to the uptake of knowledge and information across the programme. The logframe combines the theory of change end of programme outcome (policy makers and practitioners are equipped) with the intermediate outcome relating to the scale and spread of KNOWFOR products through intermediaries.

- **Outputs** focus on what partners produce (i.e. the knowledge products and engagement opportunities and participatory processes supported by KNOWFOR) and the preparatory work that partners do in order to deliver products (e.g. identification of audience etc.).
Table 5 KNOWFOR Logframe Summary Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Longer term impact</th>
<th>Longer term impact indicator 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poverty reduction, biodiversity conservation, protection of climate and other ecosystem services through improved management of forests and trees.</td>
<td>Instances of improvement at a localised scale that KNOWFOR has contributed towards:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Poverty levels amongst poor forest dependent households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Area of degraded forest landscapes restored in developing countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Area of deforestation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Amount of equivalent tonnes of carbon emissions from avoided deforestation and carbon sequestration from restored forest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shorter term impact</th>
<th>Shorter term impact indicator 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvements in forestry related policy and practice</td>
<td>Instances of change in policies or practice in targeted areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme outcome</td>
<td>Programme outcome indicator 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediaries and policymakers/practitioners in developing countries are equipped with strategic knowledge, comparable evidence, reliable tools and systematic analysis on forests, trees and climate.</td>
<td>KNOWFOR is rated as ‘Meeting expectations’ or ‘Above expectations’ in the ‘Uptake’ rubric for Level Three (policymakers and practitioners) at 2016.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output 1.1</th>
<th>Output indicator 1.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KNOWFOR partners generate targeted forest and tree related knowledge products (gender disaggregated)</td>
<td># of knowledge products and range of categories (of which at least 25% either explicitly respond to the specific needs of women and girls or generates sex differentiated knowledge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Output indicator 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># and range of KNOWFOR supported engagement process/events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Output indicator 1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># and type of products accessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Output indicator 1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of participants at KNOWFOR supported events/processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(disaggregated by gender)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output 1.2</th>
<th>Output 1.2 indicator 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KNOWFOR partners have improved understanding of their knowledge of their target audiences and uptake pathways and use those pathways more effectively.</td>
<td>KNOWFOR is rated as ‘Meeting expectations’ or ‘Above expectations’ in the ‘effective project design’ rubric for Level One at 2016 (rubric includes criteria such as whether project planning included identification of next users and knowledge pathway and the differentiated needs of women and girls)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output 1.3</th>
<th>Output 1.3 indicator 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved collaboration across KNOWFOR partners.</td>
<td># of interactions where partners planned activities for mutual benefit or a common purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Output 1.3 indicator 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of joint events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Output 1.3 indicator 1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of jointly developed products</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4. KNOWFOR baseline

In place of a conventional baseline (as the programme is 18 months into implementation) the KNOWFOR framework requires the implementation of a retrospective stocktake. The KNOWFOR stocktake will focus on Level 1 (1.1 - 1.3) in the KNOWFOR theory of change (Figure 4) and will demonstrate what progress has been made in relation to these areas since KNOWFOR commenced. Undertaking the stocktake will involve retrospectively applying a sub-set of the KNOWFOR monitoring toolkit outlined in Section 7.2.
**Level 1. KNOWFOR Partners**

At Level 1 the retrospective stocktake will focus on the **whether projects have been effectively designed** (understanding audiences and uptake pathways and collaboration) and **standardised partner outputs**. This will firstly require partners to retrospectively compile records of funded activities and associated outputs in the first 12 months of KNOWFOR implementation. Partners can use the Output log template in the M&E toolkit (Attachment 5) to organise this information.

This stocktake at Level 1 will become part of partner’s annual reflection and review processes and will provide an indication of **relative progress** while also recognise continuing high performance, even if there is not a large amount of change.

**Addressing issues of rigour and impartiality**

It is acknowledged that this stocktake relies to a large extent on self-assessment by KNOWFOR partners. This is in line with practices in a number of reputable publicly funded institutions and reflects a pragmatic assessment of the costs and time involved in externally conducted reviews. The proposed approach creates a methodology and evidence chain that can be easily cross-checked and validated if needed. In addition a protocol can be developed for an external review or spot-check process to validate the findings of the internal assessment process. In final discussions of information gaps and evaluation priorities (Section 8) this is recognised as an area that may warrant further independent inquiry.
7. Answering KNOWFOR Evaluation Questions: What data will we collect to answer our evaluation questions?

The key evaluation questions outlined in Section 4 will be addressed by collecting descriptive evidence of change using a number of different tools, then comparing results to the benchmarks and making evaluative assessments of performance.

Data will be largely collected by partners using a set of common monitoring and evaluation tools. The KNOWFOR Monitoring and Evaluation Toolkit includes the following:

- Influence log which includes provision to suggest follow up via semi-structured interviews, PPPs or Episode Study
- Episode study template
- Promising Practice Profiles (PPPs)
- Network mapping (KNOWFOR SNA approach under development)
- Event evaluations (Part 1 – 3)
- Trip report template
- Semi-structured interviews
- Digital media tracking
- Output log
- Citation analysis and content analysis
- Other relevant existing partner data collection or tracking systems

These data collection methods are described in detail in section 7.1 and each partner implementation plan contains tailored guidance on the use of these methods for their context.

The information collected at the partner level will then be aggregated (and supplemented where appropriate) by DFID to address the key evaluation questions for the whole of KNOWFOR. The relationship between the data collection methods, the programme performance expectations, key evaluation questions and the theory of change are presented in Table 6 below.
### Table 6 KNOWFOR M&E Framework Summary Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ToC Level</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Key Evaluation Question</th>
<th>Performance Benchmark</th>
<th>Key Indicators</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Level 4. Longer term impacts      | Poverty reduction, biodiversity conservation, protection of climate and other ecosystem services through improved management of forests and trees. | KEQ 5 How have changes in forestry practice influenced poverty reduction, biodiversity conservation and climate impact in developing countries? | N/A                   | Not necessarily attributable indicators:  
  - Poverty levels amongst poor forest dependent households [CONTRIBUTION]  
  - Area of degraded forest landscapes restored in developing countries [CONTRIBUTION]  
  - Area of deforestation [CONTRIBUTION]  
  - Amount of equivalent tonnes of carbon emissions from avoided deforestation and carbon sequestration from restored forest [CONTRIBUTION]  
|                                   |                                                                         |                                                                                         |                       |                                                                                                          | Externally commissioned secondary data  
  (may include Impact Evaluations, international monitoring of social, economic and environmental trends) |
| Level 3. Shorter term impacts     | Improvements in forestry related policy and practice                    | KEQ4 What outcomes, if any, did KNOWFOR contribute to?                                    | N/A                   | N/A                                                                                                      | Influence log  
  - Trip reports  
  - Vignettes                                                                                                           |
| Level 2. Programme Outcomes       | Policymakers/ practitioners in developing countries are equipped with strategic knowledge, comparable evidence, reliable tools and systematic analysis on forests, trees and climate. | KEQ3 To what extent and how did KNOWFOR equip forestry related practitioners and policy makers? | Rubric: Uptake        | KNOWFOR partners reach acceptable level of influence against the “uptake rubric”  
  (based on an aggregation of project level results) at 2016                                                                 | Episode study  
  - Vignettes  
  - Influence log  
  - Trip report  
  - Performance Story Report                                                                                               |
|                                   | Intermediaries promote, share and disseminate KNOWFOR products to policy makers and practitioners | KEQ3a. 3.a. To what extent and how did KNOWFOR influence KNOWFOR intermediaries?             |                       |                                                                                                          | Event tools  
  - Social media  
  - Influence log  
  - Output log  
  - Vignettes  
  - PPPs  
  - Trip report                                                                                                              |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>KNOWFOR partners generate targeted forest and tree related knowledge products (gender disaggregated)</th>
<th>KEQ2</th>
<th>Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.1 Outputs | How adequate was the quality, reach, volume and relevance of KNOWFOR knowledge products and engagement processes? |       | • # of knowledge products and range of categories (of which at least 25% either explicitly respond to the specific needs of women and girls or generates sex differentiated knowledge)  
• # and range of KNOWFOR supported engagement process/events (workshops, forums, meetings etc.)  
• # and type of products accessed (downloads, distributed etc)  
• # of participants at KNOWFOR supported events/ processes (disaggregated by gender). |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enabling outputs</th>
<th>KEQ 1: How well has the management and delivery of KNOWFOR supported research uptake?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>KNOWFOR partners have improved understanding of their audiences and knowledge uptake pathways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent are systems and processes in place to plan for and foster research uptake in KNOWFOR?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Improved collaboration across KNOWFOR partners.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| | To what extent has research uptake been influenced by collaboration and partnership between KNOWFOR partners? | • # of interactions where partners planned activities for mutual benefit or a common purpose  
• # of joint events  
• # of jointly developed products | Output log  
PPPs |
7.1. Data Collection

Monitoring data will be primarily collected and managed by KNOWFOR partners. Synthesised and aggregated monitoring data will be submitted to DFID in the form of Annual Reports. To complete these reports partners will draw on the data collected through both existing methods or tracking systems and a sub-set of common new methods.

Existing methods

All partners have a variety of existing internal processes for monitoring, tracking, reporting and evaluating their work. Where possible the nested partner implementation plans make use of these systems to address the programme wide evaluation questions. This framework mentions only the existing processes that are common amongst all partners.

1. Digital media tracking

All KNOWFOR partners have established systems for monitoring digital traffic, downloads and other online interactions with their knowledge products. The common outputs of these partner specific systems will be tracked by partners tracking tables and will aggregated by DFID to demonstrate scale of reach of KNOWFOR outputs.

2. Partner led evaluations

Some partners have existing systems for commissioning regular independent evaluations. In addition, if there are particular issues that are of interest to partners there may be scope for DFID to invest in KNOWFOR related evaluation work. This could be commissioned after the annual review in 2014. Possible areas for partner evaluation are outlined in each nested evaluation plan (see Attachment 1-3).

Suggested new tools

1. Output log

The output log is a simple log book or record of activities and interventions delivered with KNOWFOR investment. It records knowledge product development, delivery and engagement processes.

2. Event evaluations

Following KNOWFOR supported events a package of tools can be used to assess events (e.g. Workshops) and their influence on partners. Feedback can be elicited from partners during contact and through follow-up.

3. Trip report template

The trip report template will be used by each KNOWFOR partner organisation to collect information about the types and roles of organisations or individuals met during the trip. It will also prompt for information regarding evidence of reach, influence or impact of KNOWFOR knowledge products.
4. Semi-structured interviews

Semi-structured interviews will be conducted either with individuals (one on one) or as a group (multiple participants) with a range of stakeholders to gather in-depth descriptive information on the reach and influence of KNOWFOR. Semi-structured interviews, or some form of qualitative data collection, are an important complement to traditional monitoring systems that often focuses on the collection and management of quantifiable tracking information. By collecting qualitative data in an on-going manner, programme staff are able to more fully understand observed trends and results and gain insights from programme partners and target audiences in a timely fashion that allows for programme adaptation and improvement. Conducting interviews in an on-going fashion rather than as part of a summative or ex-post evaluation ensures that reflections, lessons and outcomes are captured at the time and reduces the risk of losing information due to staff turnover or changing programme approaches.

The interviews will be conducted by either partner M&E staff or externally contracted providers to support the development of annual reports or following on from large events. Interview informants will include KNOWFOR intermediaries and end users and KNOWFOR partner staff. Participants will be purposively selected for interviews.

Semi-structured interviews may also be used to follow-up from an influence log event (see 9. Influence Log below) or as part of a vignette or Episode Study (7 and 10 below). Interview guides for each of these purposes can be found in Attachment 5: KNOWFOR M&E Toolkit.

5. Promising Practice Profiles (PPPs)

A Promising Practice Profile is a summary document to be used by KNOWFOR partners to explain a particular practice or set of practices (ways of working) that have helped to achieve a project’s objectives. It comprises a description of the “key ingredients” of a programme/project, what was done, or what particular ways of working were important. It also includes a summary of what is known about the effectiveness or relevance of this practice (the existing evidence base), information about how a particular practice or set of practices within a programme worked on the ground (how it worked and what made it work), and the evidence linking the practice to outcomes (evidence that it worked). Profiles then become useful summary tools and guides to others who may be working to address similar issues.

6. Citation analysis and content analysis

Tracking the citations or peer reviewed and grey literature can be one way of quantifying the reach of particular outputs and provide insight into the intermediary groups that are passing on knowledge and information.

7. Vignettes

In order to capture narratives of change resulting from KNOWFOR investment mini-case studies or vignettes may be developed. These vignettes will present a sample of success-cases from a partner’s KNOWFOR project activities and should provide details of occasions where planning processes resulted in productive collaborations to influence key target audiences. These vignettes will be used in annual reports to provide tangible illustrations of the difference made by KNOWFOR.
8. Social network mapping

Social network analysis (SNA) and mapping is a social research approach and method that can be used to study and represent how social networks and relations are structured (Scott, 2009:38). SNA information can be collected via a survey tool (under development) or from existing records (i.e. email and databases). The focus of SNA is on relations (ties) between entities (nodes). Information collected via network research can be represented graphically (in matrices), visually (as a map or model) and analysed descriptively using a set of quantitative network metrics (i.e. centrality), which will then be informed by stakeholder interpretation of networks (i.e. how partners see connections). SNA may include a participatory workshop to yield enriched analysis, findings and more relevant implications for the programme.

9. Influence log

Influence logging will be undertaken by each KNOWFOR partner organisations and DFID. These logs will record staff observations and materials that indicate who is influenced by their work and when. It will include entries detailing instances of influence observed as the result of KNOWFOR funded work at an intermediary and end user level. Using the log, partners will be able to log and record instances of influence as they occur. Over time, these influences can be compiled and tracked to show a ‘chain’ or series of influences.

10. Episode study

Episode studies will be used to investigate the influence of KNOWFOR on policies or practices of targeted end users. Episode studies may be triggered by an event (i.e. a change in local government policy) documented in the influence log (see above). Using this method, a specific case or instance will be investigated in detail to determine and trace the influence of KNOWFOR on the event, and what other factors contributed to this change.

11. Performance story reports

The Performance Story Reporting technique presents a framework for reporting on contribution to long-term outcomes (or targets) using mixed methods and participatory process. The process steps include clarifying the programme logic, developing guiding questions for the social inquiry process and data trawl. Final conclusions about the extent to which a programme has contributed to outcomes are made at an ‘outcomes panel’ and recommendations are developed at a large group workshop. Performance Story Reporting in KNOWFOR may be applied at the end of programme outcome level and examine a particular activity or set of activities contribution to desired outcomes.

Ethics of Data Collection

All data collection activities need a process for enabling potential participants to make an informed decision about their involvement in the activity. The majority of KNOWFOR monitoring data involves the collection of project process and output data and importantly, does not draw on project beneficiaries. This means the ethical considerations involved in data collection are minimal. However, the M&E framework does provide for primary data collection in the form of:

- semi-structured interviews
- online event surveys and follow-up questionnaires and
- social network mapping surveys.
In these instances it is important that informants are provided with adequate information to give their informed consent to participate in the data collection activity. Obviously the degree of formality and detail required will vary depending on the scale of ethical risk and who is being consulted, in most cases it will involve the development of clear, concise statement for participants that explains:

- The purpose of the data collection process (e.g. accountability to donors, improving knowledge up-take practice, understanding the influence of our work etc)
- The types of outputs that will be generated from the information they provide, e.g. digital recordings/notes from interviews, quotes, network graphs, summary data etc.
- How their information may be used (e.g. in vignettes for reports submitted to DFID, in quotes or vignettes for internal reflection workshops, thematically assessed to draw programme wide conclusions etc., emphasising that it will be de-identified
- How their information will be managed and stored, including re-identification and de-identification etc.
- Their participation is voluntary.

In instances where in-depth, qualitative information is being collected (either face to face or via an on-line questionnaire) it is considered best practice to obtain a formal verbal or written consent. An example interview consent form is included in the M&E Toolkit and can be used as a guide where appropriate.

7.2. Synthesis

Data from the partner level KNOWFOR M&E plans will be brought together in Annual Reporting to DFID and through programme-wide forums (as occurring).

Partners will use collected data to:

1. Complete Annual Reports in an evidence based manner
2. Undertake evidence based-self assessment against the programme rubrics for uptake, intermediary and effective project design levels

Reports from partners will then be collated by the KNOWFOR programme management team into a programme wide report and logframe, using the agreed qualitative scales to assess programme performance against the logframe.

For full details on KNOWFOR rubrics and guidance on the use of these, please refer to Attachment 4.

Scalable implementation

It is anticipated that KNOWFOR partners will have varying capacity to conduct monitoring and evaluation activities and/or face institutional challenges and constraints to applying data collection and analysis methods. As noted in Section 2.5 the framework is designed to be flexibly applied across KNOWFOR partners. However it is essential that DFID has a minimum amount (see Table 8 below) of comparable evidence to tell the basic narrative of KNOWFOR achievements across all partners.
Table 8 provides a basic guide to the scaled implementation of the framework.

### Table 7 Scaling KNOWFOR M&E framework implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Data collection methods</th>
<th>Level of analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>● Output log</td>
<td>● Annual compilation of data and completion of annual report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Influence log</td>
<td>● Annual self-assessment against rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Semi-structured interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>● Essential M&amp;E activities</td>
<td>● Annual compilation of data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Event evaluations</td>
<td>● Annual internal reflection on data and progress towards outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● SNA</td>
<td>● Annual self-assessment against rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Ad hoc episode studies, event evaluation or PPPs</td>
<td>● Completion of annual report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>● Apply multiple methods against each level of the theory of change</td>
<td>● 6 monthly compilation of monitoring data and internal reflection data and progress towards outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Systematic event evaluation</td>
<td>● Annual compilation of data and completion of annual report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Episode Studies and PPPs</td>
<td>● Annual self-assessment against rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Biennial or triennial evaluations (episode studies, performance story reports etc)</td>
<td>● Annual KNOWFOR partnership reflection on learnings and progress towards outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Strategic of a range of methods (i.e. use and integration of both quantitative and qualitative approaches)</td>
<td>● Investigation into unexpected outcomes and re-development of programme theory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Evaluation: What is the data telling us?

This section describes the points at which monitoring and evaluation data collected by partners will be brought together to make programme wide evaluative judgements. In other words, it explains how data will be made sense of and performance will be evaluated. It also points to where independent evaluation could occur.

In this section the term evaluation is used in two distinct senses. It is used to mean examining the monitoring data and making ‘evaluative judgements’. This is what is often considered to be the small ‘e’ in M&E. Here we also look at the role independent evaluation studies may play (often considered as the big ‘E’, and for many people is something done additionally to M&E).

8.1. Bringing the data together to make programme wide evaluative reflection

There are a number of ways in which effective use can be made of programme monitoring data collected through KNOWFOR tools and templates.

Evidence based reflection

Annually DFID is required to submit an aggregated report about KNOWFOR as a whole. Prior to this each implementing partner sends a report of their activities to DFID. While each partner may have their own approach to completing this report template, at a minimum partners should attempt:

- to rate projects against the rubrics
- to aggregate outputs to determine and report on progress towards the quantitative outputs in the logframe
- to provide evidence based answers to the key evaluation questions.

Undertaking these tasks is an effective way of engaging with and interpreting the data collected throughout the previous year. Having consistent reporting in this regard will also enable DFID to aggregate across the three partners.

KNOWFOR ends in January 2016, so the 2014 annual report represents a ‘mid-term point’ at which to review adequacy of progress. In June 2014 KNOWFOR partners will gather together as part of an M&E workshop in Glasgow and make a first attempt at using the rubrics and assessing progress. It will be a chance to reflect on progress, but also to test the rubrics. The rubrics and targets in the logframe are framed around what should be achieved by the end of the programme, so in 2014 this judgement will be about progress towards this end point.

The process of aggregating data and making judgements to address the key evaluation questions should be repeated in 2015, in a more summative manner (focusing more on the overall effect of the intervention rather than the processes of delivery).
**Just in time reflections**

Just in time reflection is aimed at *programme improvement*. In addition to the more formal annual reflection points, it is expected that partner organisations will reflect on the results from individual evaluation tools, and make adjustments to their programming. For example, if an analysis of website statistics reveals low usage, then the people responsible should adjust their strategy. If a follow-up process for a conference or an event reveals some high ratings and usage these strategies should be shared and incorporated into the next events. So the basic principle is to re-consider strategies where feedback reveals less than expected performance. Where there is evidence that a particular strategy or activity is working particularly well there may be an opportunity to expand or replicate.

**Cross programme learning opportunities**

KNOWFOR is based on the assumption that bringing three diverse and unique partner organisations together to focus on knowledge uptake, will foster cross-organisational learning and will lead to greater efficiency and effectiveness. The participatory development of a shared M&E framework is a key enabler in realising these objectives. For this reason it is important that this M&E framework reinforces opportunities for cross programme learning. The framework has utilised the following strategies to making this happen:

- Building the theory of change together and understanding the points of similarity and difference between the three organisations
- Building the M&E framework together, to agree what we will measure and to ensure that a programme wide cohesive story of performance can be told
- Reflecting on general programme results together, and learning from each others’ successes and challenges
- Where results are particularly promising, document this experience and share them with other partners using the promising practice profiles (PPPs) M&E tool.

**8.2. Independent end of programme evaluation**

An independent evaluation of KNOWFOR is budgeted for and will feed into the end-of-programme completion process in January 2016. This evaluation would need to be completed in October/November 2015.

While this evaluation is out of the scope of this M&E plan, it makes sense to consider what the M&E plan can offer to the evaluation in terms of data, and importantly what the gaps are. However, it is important to note that good evaluations meet the needs of the key evaluation audience at a given time, and the final choice of focus for an external evaluation should be made in consultation with key DFID users of the evaluation.

The Table 8 below shows the key evaluation questions; what the M&E framework will provide and what the gaps are, and finally some recommendations for the focus of external evaluation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key evaluation questions (KEQs)</th>
<th>Evaluation sub-questions</th>
<th>What the M&amp;E will provide</th>
<th>Gaps/ limitations</th>
<th>Potential focus for evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How well has the management and delivery of KNOWFOR supported research uptake?</td>
<td>1.a. To what extent are systems and processes in place to plan for and foster research uptake in KNOWFOR?</td>
<td>Proportion of projects that are assessed as good or above against the KNOWFOR partner rubric on understanding of uptake pathways</td>
<td>This is self assessed</td>
<td>A spot check/audit on a sample of project records to verify self-reporting synthetising all examples of collaboration to make an expert assessment of whether this represented value for money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.b. To what extent has research uptake been influenced by collaboration and partnership between KNOWFOR proponents (CIFOR, IUCN and PROFOR)?</td>
<td># and type of collaboration activities undertaken (by activity type) where partners share resources for mutual benefit and a common purpose (activity reports and PPP)</td>
<td>This is not synthesised or evaluated in terms of whether it is sufficient value add.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How adequate was the quality, reach, volume and relevance of KNOWFOR knowledge products and engagement processes?</td>
<td>2.a. What outputs were delivered through KNOWFOR?</td>
<td>Outputs should be aggregated and ready for use in evaluation.</td>
<td>Does not consider the efficiency of achievement of outputs, not does it compare to alternative approaches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.b. To what extent did KNOWFOR knowledge products meet partner standards and expectations for quality?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.c. How adequate was the reach of KNOWFOR?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.d. Was the volume of knowledge products sufficient in order to influence uptake by target audiences?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.e. Were the knowledge products relevant and targeted to requirements of users appropriately?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To what extent and how did KNOWFOR equip forestry related practitioners and policy makers?</td>
<td>3.a. To what extent and how did KNOWFOR influence KNOWFOR intermediaries?</td>
<td>KNOWFOR partners reach acceptable level of influence against the “intermediary rubric” (based on an aggregation of project level results):</td>
<td>Should provide a cohesive picture of this outcome.</td>
<td>The evaluation should provide some verification of rating and evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Event tools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Social media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Influence log</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• PPPs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Trip report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3.b. To what extent and how did forest related decision-makers (policy-makers and practitioners) become more equipped with strategic knowledge, comparable evidence, reliable tools and systematic analysis on forests trees and climate as a result of KNOWFOR? | KNOWFOR partners reach acceptable level of influence against the “uptake rubric” (based on an aggregation of project level results):
- Episode study
- Influence log
- Trip report
- Performance Story Report |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. What outcomes if any, did KNOWFOR contribute to?</td>
<td>Outcomes are assessed through sampling at point of investment and through episode studies and may be captured through other tools. A gap is that there is no comprehensive picture of attribution to outcome The external evaluation is unlikely to be able to do systematic impact evaluation – nor is this recommended for this type of programme. Some contribution analysis could be included in the evaluation, or some in-depth episode studies could be commissioned but again – they would be a sample of outcomes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4.a. How were KNOWFOR products/processes used? 4b. What evidence exists of KNOWFOR products interfacing with the policy process in target areas? 4c What outcomes in policy or practice (positive and negative) occurred as a result KNOWFOR knowledge? | Influence log  
Trip reports  
Episode study  
Event evaluation follow-up |
| 5. How have changes in forestry practice influenced poverty reduction, biodiversity conservation and climate impact in developing countries? | Influences log  
Trip reports  
Not necessarily attributable indicators:  
- Poverty levels amongst poor forest dependent households  
- Area of degraded forest landscapes restored in developing countries  
- Area of deforestation  
- Amount of equivalent tonnes of carbon emissions from avoided deforestation and carbon sequestration from restored forest |
| 5a. What instances of localised impact did KNOWFOR contribute towards? 5b. What were the broader changes in forestry practices and policies in developing countries? | As above  
As above |
In summary, Table 8 shows how the KNOWFOR M&E framework (if implemented as planned) should provide a good picture of what has been done to facilitate knowledge uptake, and some indication of whether it helped equip policy and practitioners. External evaluation could therefore usefully focus upon:

1. Verifying some of the self-reported results by sampling a small number of projects to cross-check and validate.
2. Investigating the value add of KNOWFOR (including but not limited to value for money) by considering the ‘without-project’ scenario and/or the comparative advantage of delivering through the three partners as a single programme rather than three separate investments.
3. Considering alternative ways the outputs could have been achieved and how KNOWFOR could be more efficient.
4. Ascertaining the relevance of KNOWFOR to the development context.
5. Investigating lessons learned about how the programme was designed and managed.
6. Considering the sustainability and extent to which outcomes achieved are likely to endure beyond the life of the programme.
7. Reporting lessons learned from the investment in M&E and the collaborative approach taken in KNOWFOR.
9. Using M&E

This section describes how KNOWFOR partners and DFID are planning to make use of the information collected through the KNOWFOR M&E framework. It also provides an outline of the key reporting requirements that the framework needs to support.

9.1. Utilising M&E information

KNOWFOR partners identified a range of common challenges to the effective utilisation of M&E. In addition to the on-going challenge of budgeting and resourcing M&E activities, these challenges related to the quality, timing and utility of M&E products as well as the extent to which key people were engaged in interpreting and responding to M&E outputs.

What can be done to maximise utilisation?

The previous section on evaluation outlines ways that monitoring data will be used to make evaluative judgements to adjust programme strategies, and assess the progress towards expected results. In addition to this, we developed a set of strategies to encourage utilisation of the M&E system more generally:

- Plan for appropriate engagement in data analysis and reflection by ensuring a team of people is involved in thinking about and reflecting on the data. At the programme level this will happen through partners coming together to reflect of programme wide results in an annual forum.
- Incorporating cross institutional/regional learning opportunities. This will happen via shared forums, but also through the process of building the M&E framework together and developing promising practice profiles (an M&E tool).
- Ensuring that M&E plans include a clear purpose and identify what learning is expected to occur (e.g. having clear KEQs) that relate to information needs. Being clear about what theory is being testing through project activities. This strategy is being achieved by documenting a programme wide M&E plan that all partners review and endorse.
- Prioritising M&E activities and working in more efficient ways so that M&E is not a burden and that activities are conducted as planned. One strategy here is to focus on delivering a few high quality, targeted M&E activities that are simple to implement, share and reflect on. To this end partner organisations will choose the M&E tools that are of most relevance to them, with a just a few mandatory tools being prescribed across the programme.

Partner specific utilisation strategies will be further discussed in implementation plans (see Attachment 1-3).

9.2. Reporting

Reporting products that will be developed specifically for KNOWFOR are outlined in Table 9 below. In addition to the KNOWFOR specific products outlined below, each partner has a range of
internal reporting requirements that will be supported by KNOWFOR M&E processes. For details of these partner specific products, please refer to Attachment 1-3.

**Table 9 KNOWFOR Specific Reporting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting to</th>
<th>What</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KNOWFOR Programme managers</td>
<td>Annual Report</td>
<td>Annually in August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNOWFOR Programme managers. DFID senior management and KNOWFOR partners</td>
<td>Independent Evaluation</td>
<td>Nov 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID senior management</td>
<td>Project Closure</td>
<td>Jan 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 1: IUCN M&E plan

This section offers a nested Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) plan for the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) under the KNOWFOR programme. It should be read in conjunction with the KNOWFOR M&E framework. This broader framework offers the following elements to enable horizontal reporting across all KNOWFOR partners:

- a set of high level key evaluation questions
- a programme level logframe with a common set of performance standards with which to judge the effectiveness of the programme
- a common way to describe and aggregate outputs and describe actors across the three organisations
- a M&E tool kit of monitoring and evaluation tools which can be used by partners where appropriate.

While the above strategies enable us to gather data across all organisations to tell a common story, it is also important to allow sufficient flexibility in the framework to ensure that it is meaningful to IUCN. To this end this document offers a tailored monitoring and evaluation plan that nests under the KNOWFOR framework. Tailoring has occurred in this case by having:

- an IUCN specific theory of change model that nests within the programme level KNOWFOR theory of change model
- sub-questions that are tailored to IUCNs needs
- M&E tools from which partners can pick and choose methods to meet their needs and complement tools that are already in place,

This M&E plan briefly outlines the scope and purpose, key evaluation questions (KEQs), a theory of change (TOC) as well as methods and tools for IUCN M&E under KNOWFOR.

Introduction

IUCN is a global conservation network governed by a Council elected by member organisations. The Global Forest and Climate Change Programme (GFCCP) with IUCN receives and manages the KNOWFOR funding on behalf of IUCN. The GFCCP is a global thematic programme of the IUCN Secretariat and supports the forest-related activities of the Union. Most of the GFCCP’s activities are delivered jointly with IUCN regional programmes and the IUCN scientific expert commissions, and in collaboration with other global programmes. The GFCCP is guided by and contributes to IUCN’s four (4) year Intercessional Programme 2013 – 2016.

Scope

KNOWFOR is directly funding specific activities developed and implements within the GFCCP, IUCN Regional programs and implementing partners. This M&E plan will cover all Forests Landscape Restoration (FLR) activities conducted within the GFCCP by IUCN. As there is no direct authority exercised by the GFCCP over the activities of IUCN members, the implementation of
monitoring tools will need to be negotiated with partners on a project-by-project basis. The GFPCCP is implemented across multiple geographies and scales, including global, regional, national and sub-national. In order to meet information requirements across these scales, KNOWFOR M&E will need to be scalable and capable of addressing differences in partner requirements, expertizes, and capacities.

The purpose of KNOWFOR M&E for IUCN is consistent with the broader purpose at a KNOWFOR programme level. More specifically, the purpose of KNOWFOR M&E for IUCN is:

- **Learning and improvement.** To document learnings from GFPCCP initiatives at multiple scales and to feed these learnings in the programme activities funded under KNOWFOR.
- **Accountability.** To meet information requirements set by funders including DFID.
- **Knowledge.** To build on the organisational knowledge base about what works where and why for knowledge uptake. To share and apply learnings from processes of knowledge uptake.

**Key evaluation questions**

The KEQs developed at a programme level for KNOWFOR apply to IUCN at an organisational level. In addition to the sub-questions identified in the Framework (see Section 5), IUCN are interested in explicitly addressing a number of additional sub-evaluation questions. These are shown in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key evaluation questions (KEQs)</th>
<th>Evaluation sub-questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How well has the management and delivery of KNOWFOR supported research and knowledge uptake?</td>
<td>1.a. To what extent are systems and processes in place to plan for and foster knowledge uptake in KNOWFOR?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.b. To what extent has knowledge uptake been influenced by collaboration and partnership between KNOWFOR proponents (CIFOR, IUCN and PROFOR)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.c. Has the delivery of KNOWFOR influenced other donors to address broader forest landscape restoration objectives?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How adequate was the quality, reach, volume and relevance of KNOWFOR knowledge products and engagement processes?</td>
<td>2.a. What outputs were delivered through KNOWFOR?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.b. To what extent did KNOWFOR knowledge products meet partner standards and expectations for quality?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.c. How adequate was the reach of KNOWFOR?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.d. Was the volume of knowledge products sufficient in order to influence uptake by target audiences?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.e. Were the knowledge products relevant and targeted to requirements of users appropriately?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.f. Do IUCN products sufficiently address knowledge gaps?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.g. Are the right intermediaries targeted in order to support uptake by end users?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.h. Are knowledge products communicated effectively in order to maximise uptake?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To what extent and how did KNOWFOR equip forestry related practitioners and policy makers?</td>
<td>3.a. To what extent and how did KNOWFOR influence KNOWFOR intermediaries?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.b. To what extent and how did forest related decision-makers (policy-makers and practitioners) become more equipped with strategic knowledge, comparable evidence, reliable tools and...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
systematic analysis on forests trees and climate as a result of KNOWFOR?

3.c. Does IUCN sufficiently understand the information requirements of end users?

4. What outcomes if any, did KNOWFOR contribute to?

4.a. How were KNOWFOR products/processes used?
4.b. What evidence exists of KNOWFOR products interfacing with the policy process in target areas?
4.c. What outcomes in policy or practice (positive and negative) occurred as a result KNOWFOR knowledge?

5. How have changes in forestry practice influenced poverty reduction, biodiversity conservation and climate impact in developing countries and the local level?

5a. What instances of localised impact did KNOWFOR contribute towards?
5b. What were the broader changes in forestry practices and policies in developing countries?

Theory of change

The IUCN theory of change for the KNOWFOR supported work under the GFCCP is outlined below in Figure 1 below. IUCN is focused on equipping national and sub-national practitioners and global, regional and national and sub-national policy-makers and organisations research and knowledge products and resources to support the implementation forest landscape restoration (FLR) activities. IUCN is also focused on influencing the private sector’s understandings of FLR and the contribution it makes to sustainable business models. In the theory of change IUCN stimulates demand for FLR through the provision of knowledge, tools, capacity building, and funding to a range of partners including the private sector, government, landholders, implementing patterns, donors and funders, FLR champions and ambassadors, and multi-stakeholder initiatives.. IUCN also supports collaborative research efforts to improve the evidence base on FLR.
Data collection tools

The M&E framework is designed to be flexible and enable partner organisations to make use of any data collection systems that are already in place while also offering a “Toolkit” of data collection and synthesis tools to assist project staff collect and manage data if needed. The KNOWFOR Monitoring and Evaluation Toolkit includes the following templates and protocols for project teams to organise and manage their project data:

- Influence log
- Event evaluation templates (Part 1 – 3)
- Trip report template
- Semi-structured interview guides
- Output log
- Citation tracking and web-based content tracking protocol

These data collection tools are all designed to be applied as appropriate by project teams throughout the year or in line with key events (e.g. forums and conferences). They will help to avoid the last minute rush at annual reporting time and provide a robust evidence base to help you demonstrate project achievements. The toolkit also includes some tools that are more in depth and help project teams reflect on and share the learning from achievements or successful practices. These include:
• Episode study template
• Performance Story Report guide
• Promising Practice Profile templates (PPPs)
• Case study guide
• Results chart

The relationship between these data collection tools, programme outcomes and performance indicators is summarised in Table 1 below.

In addition to these specialised tools, IUCN is currently collecting information regarding their digital media traffic.

As IUCN's KNOWFOR funded initiatives are largely managed through national or regional IUCN offices and by implementing partners, there will be varying levels of capacity to use these tools. For guidance on scaling the application of KNOWFOR M&E tools, please refer to KNOWFOR M&E Framework Section 7.2.

**Reporting**

IUCN has three main reporting requirements, one is a public document and two are internal documents delivered to donors. These are:

- A reporting to IUCN Council (annually in November)
- An internal signals reports (May – June)
- An internal emerging system to report on indicators.

The format of these reports is set externally. The KNOWFOR data collection tools should produce evidence and help manage information that will support these external reporting requirements and align with the new internal system under development, but at this stage they have not been specifically targeted to address these additional needs.

In relation to KNOWFOR, IUCN is required to report annually to DFID on seven key areas:

1. Section 1: Summary of progress
2. Section 2: Contextual Change
3. Section 3: Progress on Outcome
4. Section 4: Progress on Outputs
5. Section 5: Other important results
6. Section 6: Leverage and Value for Money
7. Section 7: Challenges, Opportunities and Lessons

Data from the KNOWFOR tools will assist to complete these annual reports. The relationship between the data collection tools and the annual report is shown in Table 1.
Utilisation

IUCN identified a range of common challenges to the effective utilisation of M&E information. In addition to the on-going challenge of budgeting and resourcing M&E activities, these challenges related to the quality, timing and application of M&E products as well as the extent to which key people were engaged in a timely and productive way in the interpretation and response to M&E information.

What can be done to maximise utilisation?

In order to address these challenges, there is a range of possible utilisation strategies that are worth considering. The options include the following:

- Prioritisation M&E activities and working in more efficient ways.
- Focusing on delivering a few high quality, targeted M&E activities that are simple to use and easy to implement.
- Plan for appropriate engagement in data analysis and reflection such as:
  - Ensuring there is a team of people involved in the thinking and reflecting on the data.
  - Ensuring that key people are aware of the implications of what is being analysed.
  - Incorporating a reflection process.
- Ensuring that M&E plans include a clear purpose and identify what learning is expected to occur (e.g. having clear KEQs).
- Being clear about what theory is being testing through project activities.
- Incorporating cross institutional/regional learning opportunities.
Table 9 IUCN M&E Summary Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ToC Level</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Key Evaluation Question</th>
<th>Performance Benchmark</th>
<th>KNOWFOR method/s and tool/s</th>
<th>Relevant DFID annual report section</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 4. Longer term impacts</td>
<td>Poverty reduction, biodiversity conservation, protection of climate and other ecosystem services through improved management of forests and trees.</td>
<td>KEQ 5 How have changes in forestry practice influenced poverty reduction, biodiversity conservation and climate impact in developing countries?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Influence log Qualitative data on program outcomes Episode study Independent review/evaluation</td>
<td>• Provide information (if relevant) that gives links to progress towards the impact level</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3. Shorter term impacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-term review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improvements in forestry related policy and practice</td>
<td>KEQ4 What outcomes, if any, did KNOWFOR contribute to?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Influence log Episode study Independent review/evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td>End-of-programme (2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2. Programme Outcomes</td>
<td>Policymakers/ practitioners in developing countries are equipped with strategic knowledge, comparable evidence, reliable tools and systematic analysis on forests, trees and climate.</td>
<td>KEQ3 To what extent and how did KNOWFOR equip forestry related practitioners and policy makers?</td>
<td>Rubric: Uptake</td>
<td>Influence log Qualitative data on program outcomes Episode study Event evaluation Citation and content tracking Promising Practice Profiles (PPP) Output log Social network mapping</td>
<td>• Progress on Outcomes</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-term review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intermediaries promote, share and disseminate KNOWFOR products to policy makers and practitioners</td>
<td>KEQ3a. 3.a. To what extent and how did KNOWFOR influence KNOWFOR intermediaries?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>End-of-programme (2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>KNOWFOR partners generate targeted forest and tree related knowledge products (gender disaggregated)</td>
<td>KEQ2 How adequate was the quality, reach, volume and relevance of KNOWFOR knowledge products and engagement processes?</td>
<td>Targets</td>
<td>Activity and output log Trip report Independent review/evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Outputs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-term review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>KNOWFOR partners have improved understanding of their audiences and</td>
<td>KEQ 1a To what extent are systems and processes in place to plan for</td>
<td>Rubric: Effective project design</td>
<td>Output log Social network</td>
<td></td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge uptake pathways.</td>
<td>and foster knowledge uptake in KNOWFOR?</td>
<td>mapping</td>
<td>review End-of-programme (2016)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Improved collaboration across KNOWFOR partners.</td>
<td>KEQ 1b To what extent has knowledge uptake been influenced by collaboration and partnership between KNOWFOR partners?</td>
<td>Target Independent review/evaluation Influence log</td>
<td>• Leverage and value for money</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 2: CIFOR M&E plan

This section offers a nested Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) plan for the Centre for International Forestry Research (CIFOR) under the KNOWFOR programme. It should be read in conjunction with the KNOWFOR M&E framework. This broader framework offers the following elements to enable horizontal reporting across all KNOWFOR partners:

- a set of high level key evaluation questions
- a programme level log frame with a common set of performance standards with which to judge the effectiveness of the programme
- a common way to describe and aggregate outputs and describe actors across the three organisations
- a M&E tool kit of monitoring and evaluation tools which can be used by partners where appropriate.

While the above strategies enable us to gather data across all organisations to tell a common story, it is also important to allow sufficient flexibility in the framework to ensure that it is meaningful to CIFOR. To this end this document offers a tailored monitoring and evaluation plan that nests under the KNOWFOR framework. Tailoring has occurred in this case by having:

- a CIFOR specific theory of change model that nests within the programme level KNOWFOR theory of change model
- M&E tools from which partners can pick and choose methods to meet their needs and complement tools that are already in place.

This M&E plan briefly outlines the scope and purpose, key evaluation questions (KEQs), a theory of change (TOC) as well as methods and tools for CIFOR M&E under KNOWFOR.

Introduction

CIFOR is the lead centre for the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) Forest, Trees and Agroforestry (FTA) CGIAR Research Program (CRP). There are two sources of funding with CIFOR: CGIAR and direct donor funding (KNOWFOR funding is direct donor).

Scope

M&E for KNOWFOR will cover all KNOWFOR funded initiatives within CIFOR. As at June 2014 there are two major streams to KNOWFOR funding within CIFOR: systematic reviews and emerging initiatives. Of these two streams a total of thirteen (13) projects and activities were funded by KNOWFOR.

In line with the overall framework purpose, the purpose of M&E within KNOWFOR for CIFOR is:

- **Learning and improvement.** The monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment team (MEIA) is presently conducted at a project or activity level with CIFOR. To facilitate project
and organisational learning at an organisational level by aggregating results and sharing across themes, programmes and funding pools.

- **Accountability.** To enable CIFOR to tell a compelling story of the impact of CIFOR funded initiatives across multiple levels and scales. To track programme and project progress towards higher level objectives at a project and organizational level; i.e. towards Intermediate Development Outcomes (IDOs).

- **Knowledge.** To contribute to the knowledge base of what works, why, and where it works. Preparing lessons for wider use within the CGIAR consortium.

**Key evaluation questions**

The plan will collect data to address a set of common KNOWFOR KEQs:

- How well has the management and delivery of KNOWFOR supported research uptake?
- How adequate was the quality, reach, volume and relevance of KNOWFOR knowledge products and engagement processes?
- To what extent and how did KNOWFOR equip forestry related practitioners and policy makers?
- What outcomes if any, did KNOWFOR contribute to?
- How have changes in forestry practice influenced poverty reduction, biodiversity conservation and climate impact in developing countries?

**Theory of change**

The CGIAR FTA Program has six overall Intermediate Development Outcomes (IDOs) relating to (i) policy change; (ii) gender; (iii) income; (iv) food access; (v) wood, fuel, other forestry and other products from agro-systems, and (vi) biodiversity and ecosystem services. KNOWFOR contributes directly towards IDO number one: “Policies supporting improved livelihoods and sustainable and equitable resource management adopted”.

A simplified CIFOR impact model or theory of change (TOC) for knowledge uptake is outlined below in Figure 1. The full Forests, Trees and Agroforestry model is available from http://tinyurl.com/FTA-TOC-13 however for the purposes of KNOWFOR M&E, the Figure 1 model will be used.
As CIFOR’s work is focused on the production of high quality research, the theory of change focuses on the relationship between research, researchers, knowledge intermediaries and research users. The extensive interconnection between these different groups (in terms of setting research priorities and co-production of research etc) are acknowledged through the feedback loops up and down the theory of change. The model also acknowledges the web of networks and relationships that surround, facilitate and enable the development (including agenda setting), dissemination and up-take of research by policy makers, practitioners and the private sector. At the impact level, the theory of change notes that there are many influences at work on the ultimate practice or policy direction of research users, of which CIFOR’s work is simply one.

KNOWFOR’s support for CIFOR’s work focuses on the dissemination and knowledge exchange aspect of the theory of change and the end-of-programme outcome is:

“the extent to which research users (policy makers, practitioners and private sector interests) are equipped with strategic knowledge, comparable evidence, reliable tools and systematic analysis on forests, trees and climate”.

To provide further detail on the ways in which CIFOR is working with intermediaries (where needed, as sometimes relationships with users are direct) to reach research users, the plan

---

6 Adapted from the Economic and Social Research Council’s work on the impact of research on policy and practice
makes use of a classification system that ascribes intermediaries an organisational type and functional roles (for full details please refer to KNOWFOR M&E Framework Section 5.2).

Intermediary classifications will be used by CIFOR to monitor and report against programme wide reach at the intermediate outcome level of the KNOWFOR logframe (see Section 6.1).

Data collection tools

The M&E framework is designed to be flexible and enable partner organisations to make use of any data collection systems that are already in place while also offering a “Toolkit” of data collection and synthesis tools to assist project staff collect and manage data if needed. The KNOWFOR Monitoring and Evaluation Toolkit includes the following templates and protocols for project teams to organise and manage their project data:

- Influence log
- Event evaluation templates (Part 1 – 3)
- Trip report template
- Semi-structured interview guides
- Output log
- Citation tracking and web-based content tracking protocol

These data collection tools are all designed to be applied as appropriate by project teams throughout the year or in line with key events (e.g. forums and conferences). They will help to avoid the last minute rush at annual reporting time and provide a robust evidence base to help you demonstrate project achievements. The toolkit also includes some tools that are more in depth and help project teams reflect on and share the learning from achievements or successful practices. These include:

- Episode study template
- Performance Story Report guide
- Promising Practice Profile templates (PPPs)
- Results chart

The relationship between these data collection tools, programme outcomes and performance indicators is summarised in Table 1 below.

For more detail on these methods and tools refer to the KNOWFOR M&E framework Section 7.1. In addition to these KNOWFOR specific tools, CIFOR is also collecting data relating to KNOWFOR funded initiatives using:

- **Twitter mapping**: using customised social media monitoring solutions, CIFOR will track the social media networks generated by high profile events.

- **Communications tracking**: CIFOR has established systems for monitoring traffic, downloads and other online interactions with their knowledge products. The outputs of these systems will be compiled using a common database tool and used to demonstrate scale of reach of certain KNOWFOR outputs (see method 10 in KNOWFOR M&E Toolkit).

- **CRP-FTA performance monitoring reports**: CIFOR reports annually to the Fund Council on the results of the CGIAR Forests, Trees and Agroforestry research agenda.
Reporting

CIFOR’s key organisational reporting responsibilities are:

- CRP-FTA performance monitoring reports
- Donor driven reporting.

CIFOR has limited control over the final format of these reporting products but does have the ability to influence the internal information management systems as well as programme planning and reflection processes (reflection processes discussed further in Section 1.1.6). CIFOR are in the process of developing a suite of frameworks and tools that will eventually enable them to report on any level (Centre, CRP, country, theme). In this system, results may be aggregated and disaggregated to ascertain the progress towards CGIAR IDOs and donor funded objectives and outcomes at different levels. The KNOWFOR data collection tools may produce evidence and help manage information that will support these external reporting requirements and align with the new internal system under development, but at this stage they have not been specifically targeted to address these additional needs.

In relation to KNOWFOR, CIFOR is required to report annually to DFID on seven key areas:

1. Section 1: Summary of progress
2. Section 2: Contextual Change
3. Section 3: Progress on Outcome
4. Section 4: Progress on Outputs
5. Section 5: Other important results
6. Section 6: Leverage and Value for Money
7. Section 7: Challenges, Opportunities and Lessons

Data from the KNOWFOR tools will assist to complete these annual reports. The relationship between the data collection tools and the annual report is shown in Table 1.

Utilisation

A recent reform process within the CGIAR has resulted in a renewed emphasis on impact and outcomes from the CRPs. As a result, the CGIAR funding CIFOR receives (approximately 35% of total funding) is now tied to outcome delivery and allocated on the basis of three year work plans. At the same time the remaining 65% of direct donor funding also comes with individual donor requirements and desired outcomes. This has resulted in an increased focus within CIFOR on the need to effectively monitor and report on progress towards outcomes.

While improving data management and the ability to effectively report on outcomes is a crucial enabler of this shift towards outcomes based management, effectively utilising the information produced to improve the ability of programmes to achieve outcomes is the ultimate goal. CIFOR is under-taking extensive improvement to its systems, processes and performance metrics to support the former objectives. To deliver on the latter, a wider approach to building the

---

7 For full details on reporting requirements please refer to DFID KNOWFOR Annual Report Template
evaluation capacity within CIFOR is needed that addresses the individual motivation, skills and knowledge to plan for, implement and utilise effective monitoring and evaluation.

The process is already underway, CIFOR is currently:

- Participating in CGIAR annual forums for reflecting on progress, which provide opportunity for the identification of any consortium-wide areas of improvement and adaptation as required
- Building skills of programme teams to undertake more strategic planning in relation to targeting end users and planning for knowledge uptake (e.g. outcomes mapping)
- Commissioning external training in participatory M&E processes.

There is scope to further encourage utilisation of data by:

- Institutionalising facilitated annual reflection processes on programme monitoring data
- Building cross-partner learning opportunities
- More systematically linking project funding allocations to evidenced outcomes.
# CIFOR M&E Summary Table

Table 10 CIFOR key evaluation questions (KEQs), sub-questions, performance expectations, data sources, methods and timeframes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ToC Level</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Key Evaluation Question</th>
<th>Existing method/s and tool/s</th>
<th>KNOWFOR method/s and tool/s</th>
<th>Relevant DFID annual report section</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 4.</td>
<td>Long term impacts</td>
<td>Poverty reduction, biodiversity conservation, protection of climate and other ecosystem services through improved management of forests and trees.</td>
<td><strong>KEQ 5</strong> How have changes in forestry practice influenced poverty reduction, biodiversity conservation and climate impact in developing countries?</td>
<td>CRP-FTA performance monitoring reports compiled from existing project data</td>
<td>Influence log Episode study Independent review/evaluation Semi-structured interview</td>
<td>• Provide information (if relevant) that gives links to progress towards the impact level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3.</td>
<td>Shorter term impacts</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>KEQ 4</strong> What outcomes, if any, did KNOWFOR contribute to?</td>
<td>CRP-FTA performance monitoring reports compiled from existing project data</td>
<td>Influence log Episode study Independent review/evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improvements in forestry related policy and practice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>KEQ3</strong> To what extent and how did KNOWFOR equip forestry related practitioners and policy makers?</td>
<td>CRP-FTA performance monitoring reports compiled from existing project data</td>
<td>Episode study Influence log Event evaluation Citation and content tracking Promising Practice Profiles (PPP)</td>
<td>• Progress on Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2.</td>
<td>Programme Outcomes</td>
<td>Policymakers/ practitioners in developing countries are equipped with strategic knowledge, comparable evidence, reliable tools and systematic analysis on forests, trees and climate.</td>
<td><strong>KEQ3a.</strong> To what extent and how did KNOWFOR influence KNOWFOR intermediaries?</td>
<td>Communications tracking Project-specific</td>
<td>Activity and output log Citation and content tracking Promising Practice Profiles (PPP) log Peer review Social network mapping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output</td>
<td>(Level 2)</td>
<td>Intermediaries promote, share and disseminate KNOWFOR products to policy makers and practitioners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>KNOWFOR partners generate targeted forest and tree related knowledge products (gender disaggregated)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Outputs</td>
<td>KNOWFOR partners have improved understanding of their audiences and knowledge uptake pathways.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Improved collaboration across KNOWFOR partners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| KEQ2 | How adequate was the quality, reach, volume and relevance of KNOWFOR knowledge products and engagement processes? |
| KEQ 1a | To what extent are systems and processes in place to plan for and foster knowledge uptake in KNOWFOR? |
| KEQ 1b | To what extent has knowledge uptake been influenced by collaboration and partnership between KNOWFOR partners? |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence log</th>
<th>Project-specific</th>
<th>Progress on outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity and output log</td>
<td>Social network mapping</td>
<td>Annual Mid-term review End-of-programme (2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leverage and value for money</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 3: PROFOR M&E Plan

This section offers a nested Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) for Program on Forests (PROFOR) under the KNOWFOR programme. It should be read in conjunction with the KNOWFOR M&E framework. This broader framework offers the following elements to enable horizontal reporting across all KNOWFOR partners:

- a set of high level key evaluation questions
- a programme level logframe with a common set of performance standards with which to judge the effectiveness of the programme
- a common way to describe and aggregate outputs and describe actors across the three organisations
- a M&E tool kit of monitoring and evaluation tools which can be used by partners where appropriate.

While the above strategies enable us to gather data across all organisations to tell a common story, it is also important to allow sufficient flexibility in the framework to ensure that it is meaningful to PROFOR. To this end this document offers a tailored monitoring and evaluation plan that nests under the KNOWFOR framework. Tailoring has occurred in this case by having:

- a PROFOR specific theory of change model that elaborates on the KNOWFOR theory of change model
- M&E tools from which partners can pick and choose methods to meet their needs and complement tools that are already in place,

This M&E plan briefly outlines the scope and purpose, key evaluation questions (KEQs), a theory of change (TOC) as well as methods and tools for PROFOR M&E.

Introduction

PROFOR (Program on Forests) is a multi-donor partnership financed by the European Union, Finland, Germany, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Switzerland and the United Kingdom. PROFOR operates as a secretariat that disburses funds to World Bank and non-World Bank programmes as well as managing programmes in house.

Scope

As PROFOR is a multi-donor trust, KNOWFOR funds cannot be separated for reporting purposes. Therefore, this M&E plan is designed to apply to all PROFOR activities. Additionally, as PROFOR is hosted within the World Bank, the Secretariat is required to meet World Bank reporting, monitoring, evaluation and quality control processes. In this circumstance, to avoid duplication and align with World Bank systems, the focus of this M&E plan is to enable the Secretariat to organise data from within existing World Bank processes.

The purpose of PROFOR M&E is however consistent with the broader purpose at a KNOWFOR programme level. There is interest in conducting M&E for learning and improvement, to be
accountable to donors and to further develop a organisational knowledge about what works where and why for knowledge uptake. More specifically PROFOR is interested in:

- better understanding impact pathways
- understanding how partners fit in with overall model identifying what comparative advantage PROFOR offers
- being able to better tell the story of PROFOR’s outcomes and impacts to donors.

Key evaluation Questions

Table 1 Key Evaluation Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key evaluation questions (KEQs)</th>
<th>Evaluation sub-questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How well has the management and delivery of KNOWFOR supported knowledge uptake?</td>
<td>1.a. To what extent are systems and processes in place to plan for and foster knowledge uptake in KNOWFOR?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.b. To what extent has knowledge uptake been influenced by collaboration and partnership between KNOWFOR proponents (CIFOR, IUCN and PROFOR)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How adequate was the relevance, quality, reach, volume and relevance of KNOWFOR knowledge products and engagement processes?</td>
<td>2.a. What outputs were delivered through KNOWFOR?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.b. To what extent did KNOWFOR knowledge products meet partner standards and expectations for quality?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.c. How adequate was the reach of KNOWFOR?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.d. Was the volume of knowledge products sufficient in order to influence uptake by target audiences?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.e. Were the knowledge products relevant and targeted to requirements of users appropriately?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To what extent and how did KNOWFOR equip forestry related practitioners and policy makers?</td>
<td>3.a. To what extent and how did KNOWFOR influence KNOWFOR intermediaries?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.b. To what extent and how did forest related decision-makers (policy-makers and practitioners) become more equipped with strategic knowledge, comparable evidence, reliable tools and systematic analysis on forests trees and climate as a result of KNOWFOR?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What outcomes, if any, did KNOWFOR contribute to?</td>
<td>4.a. How were KNOWFOR products/processes used?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.b. What evidence exists of KNOWFOR products interfacing with the policy process in target areas?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.c. What outcomes in policy or practice (positive and negative) occurred as a result KNOWFOR knowledge?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How have changes in forestry practice influenced poverty reduction, biodiversity conservation and climate impact in developing countries?</td>
<td>5.a. What instances of localised impact did KNOWFOR contribute towards?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.b. What were the broader changes in forestry practices and policies in developing countries?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Theory of Change

PROFOR’s major focus is on providing targeted policy advice to reform-minded technical departments in governments at national, subnational and local levels. This reflects the strategic
advantage PROFOR has in being positioned within the World Bank with close engagement with regional operations teams and a range of other networks and communities of practice. There is also a focus on influencing the private sector’s policies and processes through engaging with small and medium enterprises as well as large-scale foreign direct investors. Figure 1 presents a diagrammatic summary of PROFOR’s theory of change.
**Figure 1: PROFOR Theory of change**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KNOWFOR PROGRAM OUTCOME</th>
<th>Improvements in environmental outcomes</th>
<th>Improvements in livelihoods for forest dependent communities</th>
<th>Improvements in forestry practice</th>
<th>Changes in forestry policy and practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policymakers and Practitioners</strong></td>
<td>POLICY AND DECISION MAKERS HAVE ACCESS TO STRATEGIC KNOWLEDGE, RELIABLE INFORMATION, TOOLS AND CLIMATE DATA AT THEIR DISPOSAL.</td>
<td>REFORM MINDED STAKEHOLDERS HAVE ACCESS TO RELEVANT TOOLS AND GUIDANCE TO SUPPORT SUSTAINABLE FOREST INVESTMENT.</td>
<td>PRIVATE SECTOR ACTORS ARE APPROPRIATELY NETWORKED AND SUPPORTED BY TARGETED RESEARCH AND KNOWLEDGE PRODUCTS INFLUENCED BY HIGH QUALITY RESEARCH.</td>
<td>WORLD BANK’s LENDING PROGRAMS ARE EQUIPPED WITH APPROPRIATE AND NECESSARY INFORMATION.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The theory of how knowledge uptake occurs as a result of PROFOR’s activities is largely implicit and informed by expert assessments of what are likely to be successful approaches at various stages in the concept design and review process.

It is important to note that different actors are engaged at different points in the creation and dissemination of these products, depending on the strategy adopted at the Concept Note review stage. This means that there is a degree of overlap between PROFOR’s collaborators/research partners and the stakeholders that act as intermediaries or conduits for their knowledge products to reach the ultimate end-users of the information (ie policy makers and practitioners).

In the public policy space PROFOR recognises the need to engage with governments in order to stimulate change processes from within while at the same time engaging with civil society to generate pressure for change externally. Each of these approaches involves a range of knowledge generation and dissemination processes and a number of stakeholder groups.

In terms of stimulating internal change, PROFOR’s most direct and effective pathway for equipping policy makers with the tools and information they need to make policy decisions, is to work closely with the World Bank’s regional operations personnel. This provides PROFOR with an insight into the needs and emerging demands of target governments, which then informs the resources and knowledge products they produce. It also provides the opportunity to embed their toolkits and assessment processes into country reform programmes that are tied to lending packages. In addition to these strategic benefits, being part of internally hosted forums and communities of practice provides the opportunity for PROFOR to spread awareness of their products.

Other pathways to public sector policy uptake include targeted engagement with certain actors within the NGO sector (for example with Forest Trends to highlight the value of natural ecosystems services to policy makers through the development and promotion of information hubs, assessment tools and place-based research). Influence on public sector debates also occurs through serendipitous personal encounters with decision makers that take place at forest sector forums and events.

In order to stimulate external debate that might bring pressure to bear on policy reform, PROFOR also engages in more broad scale and untargeted dissemination of their knowledge products largely through digital communication. This pathway to uptake is also supported through the strategic involvement of civil society in multi-stakeholder participatory assessment and action planning processes (the logic being that by building a sense of ownership over process outcome civil society will maintain external pressure on government departments to follow through).

In order to influence policy makers and practitioners within the private sector, PROFOR have supported initiatives relating to benefit sharing, ecosystems services, forest sector finance and forest investment. Together these activities are aiming to:

- engage decision makers and investors in the private sector in dialogue with governments, NGOs, communities and thought leaders to increase mutual understand between diverse forest sector actors
- build a robust evidence base in relation to the financial viability of sustainable forestry practices by filling identified knowledge gaps, servicing local/regional information needs and providing place-based guidance or support
• build on existing knowledge to produce tools to meet the needs of small and medium forestry enterprises
• influence the agenda of policy makers to create sound policy frameworks for the private sector to operate within.

As a result, the global agenda relating to the forest sector will be influenced by high quality research; reform-minded states will have access to relevant tools and guidance to support sustainable forestry investment; low capacity small to medium forest enterprises would have capable institutional support networks; and World Bank lending programmes would be equipped with appropriate and necessary information. These outcomes would contribute to the KNOWFOR end of programme outcome by providing some private sector decision makers and practitioners with appropriate information to make well informed decisions.

Data Collection Tools

There are set reporting and quality control processes associated with PROFOR funds and fund recipients understand that activities may be subject to evaluation processes to better understand the impact of PROFOR’s funding. This M&E plan makes use of PROFOR’s existing systems and monitoring processes to organise evidence around a set of key evaluation questions. The existing tools that this framework aligns with are:

1. Concept Notes
2. Annual Progress Reports (APRs)
3. Completion notes
4. Communications tracking
5. Trip Reports and Back to Office Reports

These existing tools and they way in which they can be used to manage evidence in relation to PROFOR’s KEQs is outlined in detail below.

In addition to the existing tools and processes outlined above, PROFOR has the option of adopting a range of implementing a range of specially designed KNOWFOR data collection tools. The programme wide suite of data collection tools includes:

• Influence log
  – linked to semi-structured interviews for follow up and
  – potentially leads into PPPs or Episode Studies
• Episode study
• Promising Practice Profiles (PPPs)
• Performance Story Reports
• Network mapping (KNOWFOR SNA approach under development)
• Event evaluations (Part 1 – 3)
• Trip report template
• Semi-structured interviews
• Output log
• Citation analysis and content analysis
These data collection tools are discussed in detail in the KNOWFOR M&E Framework Section 7.1.

1. Concept Notes

Concept notes are submitted to the Secretariat for review prior to funding being allocated. These concept notes require the identification of audiences and proposed approaches for their engagement through the process. These concept notes should also identify outputs and outcomes and some indication of how progress will be measured and documented. Each note undergoes successive rounds of expert/peer review by thematic specialists to assess the overall concept and the appropriateness of strategies for engaging with end-users/audiences.

Concept notes provide evidence regarding approached to planning and engagement with target audiences that will assist in answering KEQ1. KEQs and sub-questions can be used to structure the collection of information from these standard products.

As concept notes indicate the systems and processes that are going to be used to track progress, there is also scope for PROFOR to recommend the use of a range of purpose designed knowledge uptake monitoring tools by implementing partners where appropriate.

There is also scope to utilise the KNOWFOR effective project design rubric (Attachment 4) as a form of quality control when reviewing concept notes as appropriate. By setting out an agreed framework for quality in relation to planning for successful knowledge uptake, the rubric is also a valuable tool at the planning and programme approval stages.

2. Annual Progress Reports (APRs)

Annual Progress Reports are narrative reports completed annually by Project/Initiative managers (in the World Bank this is the Task Team Leaders, sometimes from within the PROFOR Secretariat themselves). Annual Progress Reports (APRs) list outcomes, outputs and evidence of how these are being achieved, which are meant to be consistent with the outputs and outcomes used in the Concept Note. The APRs are guided by standard reporting templates with some guidance notes provided. They are populated with evidence gained from professional observations and insights of TTL or project managers. As such there is no consistent, mandated evidence base that sits behind these reports.

APRs provide evidence regarding the reach and influence of PROFOR funded activities that will assist in answering KEQ2 and KEQ3. By using the KEQs and sub-questions to structure the information collected through these APRs, PROFOR programme managers will have a clear sense of whether they are receiving relevant and timely information from implementing partners and will provide a framework for seeking further information as required.

While the overall consistency and robustness of these reports could be strengthened by the introduction of standardised data collection tools and systems, having a common information synthesis framework (KEQs and sub-questions) will at the least drive consistency in the types of information collected from implementers.

3. Completion notes

Completion notes are once-off reports submitted at the conclusion of a funding period. These are the same format as the Annual Progress reports but are summative. As with APRs these notes will provide data useful to addressing KEQ 2 and 3 and should provide insights around KEQ 4.
4. Communications tracking

PROFOR keeps records of:

- communications products by media (i.e. workshops and seminars, publications, newsletters, stories on World Bank portals, videos etc.)
- distribution and reach of knowledge products by media (i.e. newsletters, web-hits, downloads, events etc.)

This data provides valuable evidence of outputs and can be used to address question 2a.

5. Trip Reports and Back to Office Reports

These are narrative trip reports that describe purpose of visits and activities undertaken and may provide some information regarding the intermediaries engaged/end users accessed. Trip reports will provide evidence regarding the reach and influence of PROFOR funded activities that will assist in answering KEQ2 and KEQ3.

However, the quality of the information in these will be variable as the trip reports are not structured around specific information needs. Within the PROFOR secretariat there may be scope for modifying the template of trip reports to ensure that useful monitoring data is captured.

Reporting

PROFOR has two main reporting requirements:

1. Annual Report to Advisory Board

PROFOR’s advisory board is made up of the eight key donors that oversee the work of the Secretariat. PROFOR has control over the structure, content and themes of this report and it currently consists of a thematic analysis of common themes emerging from a desktop review of progress reports.

2. Public Annual Report

PROFOR has control over the structure and content of this report and it currently consists of:

- summary of programme activities
- success case samples of current activities
- budget reporting.

This report is a public document and downloadable from the website.

Ex-post evaluations

It would be PROFOR has an established process to complete periodic ex-post evaluations. These are externally contracted impact evaluations focused on a chosen area of interest or strategic area. The focus for the next evaluation has not yet been established.
Evaluations to date have been retrospective and have not been able to draw on monitoring data to tell a story of cumulative impact. By having a structured monitoring plan, the evaluations will have a clearer sense of actual achievements based on timely, on-going collection of data.

For further details regarding recommended areas of future evaluations, please refer to Section 8.2 of the overarching framework.

**Utilisation Strategies**

PROFOR has points within its annual project cycle that would naturally accommodate the strategic use of M&E data. There are opportunities for reflection and learning at both the task or project level as well as the PROFOR-wide level. At the project level when Annual project reports are produced, task team leaders have the opportunity to bring together the data collected from the activities and reflect on effectiveness in relation to key evaluation questions. Similarly when compiling the annual report across all funded initiatives, the opportunity exists reflect against the higher level evaluation questions in order to identify potential programme-wide modifications or changes in direction.

For more details regarding general learning, reflection and utilisation strategies please refer to the KNOWFOR M&E Framework Section 9.
# PROFOR M&E Plan Summary Table

## Table 2. PROFOR key evaluation questions (KEQs), sub-questions, performance expectations, data sources, methods and timeframes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ToC Level</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Key Evaluation Question</th>
<th>Existing data source and method</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 4. Longer term impacts</strong></td>
<td>Poverty reduction, biodiversity conservation, protection of climate and other ecosystem services through improved management of forests and trees.</td>
<td>KEQ 5 How have changes in forestry practice influenced poverty reduction, biodiversity conservation and climate impact in developing countries?</td>
<td><strong>Existing</strong>&lt;br&gt;Output and Influence logs to be completed drawing on:&lt;br&gt;- Completion notes&lt;br&gt;- Annual Progress Reports&lt;br&gt;Independent evaluation (if appropriate/relevant) <strong>Recommended</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Semi-structured interviews</strong></td>
<td>Annual&lt;br&gt;End-of-programme (2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 3. Shorter term impacts</strong></td>
<td><strong>Improvements in forestry related policy and practice</strong></td>
<td>KEQ4 What outcomes, if any, did KNOWFOR contribute to?</td>
<td><strong>Existing</strong>&lt;br&gt;Output and Influence logs to be completed drawing on:&lt;br&gt;- Completion notes&lt;br&gt;- Annual Progress Reports&lt;br&gt;- Digital media monitoring&lt;br&gt;- Trip reports <strong>Recommended</strong>&lt;br&gt;- Event evaluation tools</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 2. Programme Outcomes</strong></td>
<td>Policymakers/practitioners in developing countries are equipped with strategic knowledge, comparable evidence, reliable tools and systematic analysis on forests, trees and climate.</td>
<td>KEQ3 To what extent and how did KNOWFOR equip forestry related practitioners and policy makers?</td>
<td><strong>Existing</strong>&lt;br&gt;Output and Influence logs to be completed drawing on:&lt;br&gt;- Completion notes&lt;br&gt;- Annual Progress Reports&lt;br&gt;- Digital media monitoring&lt;br&gt;- Trip reports <strong>Recommended</strong>&lt;br&gt;- Event evaluation tools</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intermediaries promote, share and disseminate KNOWFOR products to policy makers and practitioners</td>
<td>KEQ3a. 3.a. To what extent and how did KNOWFOR influence KNOWFOR intermediaries?</td>
<td><strong>Existing</strong>&lt;br&gt;Activity and output log&lt;br&gt;log drawing on:&lt;br&gt;- Completion notes&lt;br&gt;- Annual Progress Reports&lt;br&gt;- Trip reports&lt;br&gt;- Digital media monitoring</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>KNOWFOR partners generate targeted forest and tree related knowledge products (gender disaggregated)</td>
<td>KEQ2</td>
<td>Existing Output log log drawing on:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Outputs</td>
<td>How adequate was the quality, reach, volume and relevance of KNOWFOR knowledge products and engagement processes?</td>
<td>Completion notes, Annual Progress Reports, Trip reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>KNOWFOR partners have improved understanding of their audiences and knowledge uptake pathways.</td>
<td>KEQ 1a</td>
<td>Existing Concept notes, Peer review processes, Recommended Semi-structured interviews, Social network mapping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent are systems and processes in place to plan for and foster knowledge uptake in KNOWFOR?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Improved collaboration across KNOWFOR partners.</td>
<td>KEQ 1b</td>
<td>Recommended Output log</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent has knowledge uptake been influenced by collaboration and partnership between KNOWFOR partners?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 4: KNOWFOR Rubrics

‘Rubrics’ have been used in this framework to provide an evaluative description of what below adequate, adequate and above adequate programme performance will “look like”. Developed in consultation with KNOWFOR partners and informed by the KNOWFOR White Paper looking into evidence-based policy and practice (Clear Horizon, 2014), two separate rubrics have been developed for KNOWFOR. These rubrics describe performance quality in relation to:

- Uptake by intermediaries and policy-makers/practitioners (Level 2)
- Partners planning for knowledge uptake (Level 1.2).

The rubrics will be applied at the project, organisation and programme level.

Theory of Change Level 1.2: Effective design at the project level

Rubric to be scored at baseline and in 2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Above expectations</th>
<th>Some of the criteria have been conducted in an exemplary manner, and the all criteria (see below) have been addressed to a reasonable extent.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project designs/plans fully meet expectations</td>
<td>All of the criteria that are relevant to the project have been addressed to a reasonable extent. Criteria are that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The knowledge uptake pathway is clearly articulated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The project has done some work to identify end user information requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Where relevant, partners have been engaged in the project design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The project has an implicit or explicit dissemination plan in place. In the absence of a written plan project managers are able to explain how dissemination is intended to occur. They may be planning to make this explicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The project has been assessed for gender relevance. Where relevant the project plans are proactive about considering the needs of women and girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- An M&amp;E framework for the project has been developed including selection of appropriate M&amp;E tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project designs/plans partially meet expectations</td>
<td>Four or more of the criteria relevant to the project have been addressed to a reasonable extent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below expectations</td>
<td>Two or more of the criteria relevant to the project have not yet been addressed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Theory of Change Level 1.2: Project design across the organisation

Rubric to be scored at base line and in 2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Above expectations</th>
<th>The organisationally relevant criteria below are met:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• More than 75% of new projects ‘meet expectations’ (or above) for project design and from this at least 20% rate as ‘above expectations’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There has been some cross-transference of good practice - some projects/initiatives or organisations external to KNOWFOR have adopted KNOWFOR’s project design or M&amp;E standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Up to 25% of existing KNOWFOR projects are revised to reflect improved design and M&amp;E standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Those projects rating below expectations are able to provide a sound rationale for not ‘meeting expectations’ (or above) and are on track to achieve acceptable performance in the long-term.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meets expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meets expectations</th>
<th>50 - 75% of relevant(^8) new projects ‘meet expectations’ (or above) for enabling work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• At least half of the projects that rate below expectations are able to provide a sound rationale for not ‘meeting expectations’ (or above).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Below expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Below expectations</th>
<th>Less than 50% relevant new projects ‘meet expectations’ or above for enabling work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Of those projects being rated at below expectations less than half are able to provide sound rationale for not ‘meeting expectations’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Theory of Change Level 2: Uptake at the project level

Rubric to be scored in 2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Above expectations</th>
<th>There is evidence that that the majority of targeted audiences (intermediaries and/or end users) have been reached or equipped as articulated in project plans AND EVIDENCE OF ONE OF THE FOLLOWING:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Unanticipated boundary partners are equipped or reached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Knowledge products inform policy debate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Instances of policy being influenced or changed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Instances of practice change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meets expectations

| Meets expectations | There is evidence that that the majority of targeted audiences (intermediaries and/or end users) have been reached or equipped as articulated in project plans. |

Below expectations

| Below expectations | Evidence suggests that substantially less targeted audiences (intermediaries and/or end users) were reached or equipped than was planned |

\(^8\) KNOWFOR partner led projects for CIFOR, new projects for PROFOR and the Global Forest Landscape Programme as a whole for IUCN
Theory of Change Level 2: Uptake at the organisational level

Rubric to be scored in 2016.

| Above expectations | More than 50% of projects rate ‘meet expectations’ (or above) for uptake (Level two project rubric); and from this at least 30% rate as “above expectations”.
| | Those projects rating below expectations are able to provide a sound rationale for not ‘meeting expectations’ (or above) and most are likely to achieve acceptable levels of uptake in the long term.

| Meets expectation | There is evidence that more than 50% of targeted audiences (intermediaries and/or end users) have been reached or equipped at as articulated in project plans.

| Below expectations | Less than 50% of projects ‘meet expectations’ or above for uptake (level two project rubric)
| | Of those projects being rated at below standard less than half are able provide sound rationale for not ‘meeting expectations’.

Performance at the KNOWFOR LEVEL

Table 11. Theory of Change Level 1 Performance Summary Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ToC Level</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIFOR Level 1.2</td>
<td>Meets expectations</td>
<td>Choose an item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFOR Level 1.2</td>
<td>Choose an item.</td>
<td>Choose an item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUCN Level 1.2</td>
<td>Choose an item.</td>
<td>Choose an item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNOWFOR Overall</td>
<td>Choose an item.</td>
<td>Choose an item.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Theory of Change Level 2 Performance Summary Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ToC Level</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIFOR Level 2</td>
<td>Choose an item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFOR Level 2</td>
<td>Choose an item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUCN Level 2</td>
<td>Choose an item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNOWFOR Overall</td>
<td>Choose an item.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Guidelines for using rubrics

Rubrics will be used by partners (CIFOR, PROFOR and IUCN) and DFID to assess the performance of the programme at the end of the programme in 2016. Milestones have also been identified for July 2014. Rubrics have been developed for KNOWFOR at the following levels of the Theory of Change (ToC):

- Uptake at Level Two of the theory of change
- Planning for uptake and gender in project planning at Level 1.2 of the theory of change.

The rubrics are pitched at two levels, for use with an individual project, for use by the organisation. There is also a summary table to bring the results together for all partners.

They will be used separately for each partner organisation (CIFOR, PROFOR and IUCN) to interpret results and then aggregated at a programme level by DFID to provide an overall judgement on programme performance.

**Partners**

Instructions for using rubrics by partners:

- Prior to the reporting timeframe (mid-year) refer to your M&E plan to determine what information you will require to assess projects against the rubric, if there are any foreseen gaps it may be necessary to undertake additional data collection.
- Collate and compile available evidence from KNOWFOR funded projects for the Annual Review.
- Focus on one project at a time, examine the results, and rate the project using the project level rubrics. Substantiate why each project has been given the particular ratings (this can be fed back to projects along with suggestions for improvement - the rating process can also be done together with the projects teams if appropriate). Where there is incomplete or insufficient evidence to rate performance, note this in the narrative that accompanies the rubric.
- Complete this task for all projects, then aggregate the results up, and rate the organisational performance using the organisational rubrics. Select the rating that best represents overall performance on balance. Substantiate why have allocated yourselves this rating and consider how you might improve your performance.
- Complete the narrative accompaniment to the rubric providing a justification for ratings given. Refer to evidence summary in the Annual Review.
- Submit completed rubrics to DFID as part of the Annual Review.

**DFID**

Instructions for using Overall KNOWFOR rubric by DFID:

1. Receive and collate completed rubrics from partners (CIFOR, PROFOR and IUCN).
2. Review assessments made in each rubric referring to the evidence to support ratings in the Annual Review. If necessary, clarify ratings in consultation with partners.
3. Make a performance judgement for ‘uptake’ (Level 2) and ‘enabling’ (Level 1.2) separately. Compile separate performance ratings for ‘uptake’ and ‘enabling’ for each partner. If partner performance ratings do not conform to criteria make a judgement on overall performance for the rating that best fits and represents.

4. Make an overall performance judgement for ‘uptake’ and ‘enabling’ combined. Again, if the ratings do not conform to the criteria (i.e. ‘Above expectations’ for ‘Enabling’ and ‘Below expectations’ for ‘Uptake’), make an overall rating based on what best fits (either by averaging or through a discretionary judgement, supported by a clear rationale and evidence).

Repeat steps in successive years as required.

References

Attachment 5: M&E Toolkit

See Huddle folder.
## Attachment 6: Glossary and key terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terms</th>
<th>Working definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Activities are conducted to bring a change in a situation or behaviour that is expected to contribute to outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution</td>
<td>Attribution implies causation and involves drawing causal links and explanatory conclusions about the relationship between observed changes, whether anticipated or not, and specific interventions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broader goals</td>
<td>The development goals that this project (amongst other things) will contribute towards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution</td>
<td>Contribution implies that an intervention contributed causally to a change but was not the sole factor in generating change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling outputs</td>
<td>The preparatory work that partners do in order to deliver products etc. (identification of audience etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End User</td>
<td>End users in KNOWFOR are the ultimate target groups named in the end of programme outcome – ie policy makers and practitioners in developing countries. These are the target groups that KNOWFOR partners are attempting to equip with information through the intermediaries identified in the KNOWFOR theory of change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End-of-programme outcomes (EOPOs)</td>
<td>These are the specific outcomes that we feel the project can make a significant impact on by the end of the programme. Pitched carefully to represent value for money, but possible to achieve if all goes well (at a stretch).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipped</td>
<td>At the end of programme level, KNOWFOR is using “equipped” in relation to policy makers and practitioners having access to key forest-related knowledge and information. It is recognized that, to be effective, such knowledge and information should be tailored based on the skills, capacity, and broader enabling environment of intended audiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Evaluation is a systematic determination of a subject’s merit, worth and significance, using criteria governed by a set of standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundational activities</td>
<td>Preliminary activities that inform any influence activities associated with changing or influencing things in countries receiving aid. It can include planning, collecting base-line data and forming partnerships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>The broader development objectives (e.g. reductions in poverty, improved protection biodiversity etc.) that a programme will contribute towards. At this level, changes will be not necessarily attributable to a programme’s work. Impacts are used to illustrate the broader changes that are occurring across the sector as the result of combined efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>An indicator is the operationalization of a variable used in an evaluation. It is what is measured to signify performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediaries</td>
<td>Intermediaries in the KNOWFOR M&amp;E framework is a general term that is used to describe those stakeholders that KNOWFOR partners interact with or utilise to reach their ultimate end users. These stakeholders have been given both a functional classification in relation to the programme (eg advocates,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Intermediate                               | Medium term outcomes that occur as a result of the outputs and that are necessary preconditions for the achievement of end-of-programme
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>outcomes</th>
<th>outcomes (there may be several levels of these intermediate outcomes).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key Evaluation Questions</td>
<td>Key Evaluation Questions are overarching and explicitly evaluative questions which guide the focus on evaluative inquiry and monitoring activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNOWFOR partners</td>
<td>CIFOR, PROFOR, IUCN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNOWFOR partnership</td>
<td>CIFOR, PROFOR, IUCN and DFID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical framework</td>
<td>A logical framework or ‘logframe’ is a form of generic programme logic commonly used in international development. The logframe matrix consists of a narrative summary, divided into four levels of objectives: goal, purpose, outputs and activities. For each level the matrix records verifiable indicators, means of verification and important assumptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>A procedure, technique or process to collect information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>A body of methods, rules, and assumptions employed by a discipline: a particular procedure or set of procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>Monitoring is the systematic and routine collection of information from projects and programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outputs</td>
<td>Any immediate changes or tangible products that are a direct result of the influence activities – and lead to the intermediate outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>In the KNOWFOR framework the term ‘project’ is used to mean any KNOWFOR supported initiative, event or activity conducted directly by KNOWFOR partners or financed through KNOWFOR to be implemented by a third party.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubric</td>
<td>‘Rubrics’ are tools that have are used to provide an evaluative description of what programme performance will substantially “look like” (Davidson, 2005: 247). Rubrics provide a transparent way of assessing programme performance by pre-defining criteria for determining effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory of change</td>
<td>In this framework theory of change will be used the general sense to describe the understanding of how funded activities result in policy makers and practitioners being equipped with information. The development of the KNOWFOR theory of change relied on a people/stakeholder centred approach that focused on naming the intermediaries that would pass on, assist or reinforce the message of KNOWFOR knowledge products. In this framework, theory of change would replace the use of terms such as: Programme logic Uptake pathway Impact pathway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool</td>
<td>The instrument that is used to collect data (i.e. an online questionnaire, an interview guide, a trip report template etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilisation-focused evaluation</td>
<td>Utilisation-Focused Evaluation (UFE), developed by Michael Quinn Patton, is an approach based on the principle that an evaluation should be judged on its usefulness to its intended users. Therefore evaluations should be planned and conducted in ways that enhance the likely utilisation of both the findings and of the process itself to inform decisions and improve performance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 7: KNOWFOR White Paper

See Huddle Folder.
Attachment 8: DFID Guide

This document provides guidance for DFID KNOWFOR programme managers in the collation and synthesis of M&E data from the three KNOWFOR partners. The document provides the practical advice to enable horizontal reporting across all KNOWFOR partners and makes use of the following features in the KNOWFOR M&E framework:

- a set of high level key evaluation questions
- a program level log frame with a common set of performance standards with which to judge the effectiveness of the programme
- a common way to describe and aggregate outputs and describe actors across the three organisations
- a M&E tool kit of monitoring and evaluation tools which can be used by partners where appropriate.

Compiling KNOWFOR M&E reporting products

DFID carries ultimate responsibility for compiling information from the three KNOWFOR partners into a format that conveys and convincing and compelling, programme wide narrative. In order to do this DFID programme managers will need to draw on a range of newly developed and existing reporting products and processes. Figure one provides an overview of the relationship between the different elements of the KNOWFOR Framework and the key reporting deliverables.

Figure 1: Relationship between KNOWFOR M&E and reporting products
Reporting Products

DFID programme managers have three key reporting products to deliver prior to the conclusion of this round of KNOWFOR funding, as summarised in Table 1.

Table 1 KNOWFOR Reporting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting to</th>
<th>What</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DFID senior management</td>
<td>Annual Report and logframe</td>
<td>August 2014, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID senior management and KNOWFOR partners</td>
<td>Independent Evaluation</td>
<td>Nov 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID senior management</td>
<td>Project Closure</td>
<td>Jan 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annual Report and logframe

In order to complete Annual Reports DFID is reliant on the submission of annual partner reports in a template that asks for information on seven key areas:

1. Section 1: Summary of progress
2. Section 2: Contextual Change
3. Section 3: Progress on Outcome
4. Section 4: Progress on Outputs
5. Section 5: Other important results
6. Section 6: Leverage and Value for Money
7. Section 7: Challenges, Opportunities and Lessons.

The monitoring data that informs these reports will be collected and managed by KNOWFOR partners. Under the revised M&E framework partners will collect and manage output and outcome data in line with standardised outputs and intermediary groupings.

There are also common processes for assessing progress and quality across the many individual projects that are receiving KNOWFOR funding. The synthesis products of this monitoring data will be submitted to DFID in the form of Annual Reports in August every year. To complete these reports partners will draw on the data collected through both existing methods or tracking systems and a sub-set of common new methods (refer to Attachment 1-3).

Supplementary DFID collected data

Influence log

There are compelling examples of how KNOWFOR supported initiatives have influenced changes in policy and how DFID’s own programmes are drawing on products to develop the rationale for other programme concept notes. These need to be captured and become part of the KNOWFOR story.

As there is also interest in the extent to which DFID is being influenced by the knowledge produced by KNOWFOR partners, there is one data collection tool that will be owned and managed by DFID. DFID will keep an internal influence log that tracks the (full details of this tool can be found in the KNOWFOR framework Section 7.1 and Attachment 5).
**Vignettes**

There may be Annual Reporting cycles where limited partner capacity or tight time frames make it impractical to use the full suite of monitoring and reporting tools. In these situations, minimal output reporting (using the Activity Report tool, KNOWFOR M&E Toolkit, Attachment 5, Method 3) combined with a few vignettes focusing on key results is a viable alternative. Although this approach will substantially reduce the rigour of the M&E as a whole, the balance of qualitative data and whole of programme reporting will at a minimum provide a snapshot of programme wide results and the processes that are supporting achievement of outcomes.

DFID can either directly commission or support partners to develop a series of mini-case studies or vignettes that capture narratives of change resulting from KNOWFOR investment. These vignettes will present a sample of success-cases from a partner’s KNOWFOR project activities and should provide details of occasions where planning processes resulted in productive collaborations to influence key target audiences. These vignettes will be used in annual reports to provide tangible illustrations of the difference made by KNOWFOR.

**Rapid Response Mechanism**

As part of the KNOWFOR programme, DFID manages a Rapid Response Mechanism through which it commissions pieces of strategic but opportunistic work outside of the partnership arrangement. This funding has been used to support a range of conferences, forums, pieces of analysis etc. The results of these smaller investments also need to be reported on as broader KNOWFOR story. In order to capture this information funded project managers will be asked to respond to a brief email questionnaire and track outputs against relevant KNOWFOR targets.

*Follow-up questionnaire for Rapid Response Mechanism Funding*

These people will be approached via email to respond to 4 simple questions:

8. What activity did you undertake with the KNOWFOR funding? Why did you choose to focus on this?

9. What knowledge products or engagement processes did you produce as a result? Why did you take this approach?

10. Is there any evidence of the influence of these knowledge products on either other forestry/forestry relate actors or your key target audiences?

11. Were there any key lessons learned about how to successfully engage key stakeholders or target audiences as the result of your work?

**Table 2 KNOWFOR indicator tracking table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KNOWFOR indicators</th>
<th>Contribution to indicators this reporting period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• # of products and range of categories (of which at least 25% either explicitly respond to the specific needs of women and girls or generates sex differentiated knowledge)</td>
<td>1 toolkit (gender relevant – explicitly responds to needs of women and girls)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• # and range of KNOWFOR supported engagement process/ events (workshops, forums, meetings etc.)</td>
<td>2 forums with key local government stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• # and type of products accessed (downloads, distributed etc)</td>
<td>32 hard copies distributed in Uganda 6 downloads of digital product</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# of participants at KNOWFOR supported events/ processes (disaggregated by gender)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event/ Process</th>
<th>Gender Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st forum</td>
<td>12 women, 20 men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd forum</td>
<td>13 women, 30 men</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Completing the logframe**

In order to complete the revised KNOWFOR logframe, DFID programme managers will need to aggregate two key pieces of partner reporting data:

12. Quality rubrics
13. Targets.

**Guidelines for using rubrics**

Rubrics will be used by DFID to assess the performance of the programme on an annual basis. Rubrics have been developed for KNOWFOR at the following levels of the Theory of Change (ToC):

- Uptake by end-users (policy makers and practitioners) and intermediaries at Level Two
- Project design by partners at Level One.

The rubrics are pitched at three levels, for use with an individual project, for use by the organisation and for use at the KNOWFOR level.

They will be used at an organisational-level to coincide with the DFID Annual Review during June/July. They will be used separately for each partner organisation (CIFOR, PROFOR and IUCN) to interpret results from the Annual Review and then aggregated at a programme level by DFID to provide an overall judgement on programme performance at 2014 and 2016 (effective project design) and at 2016 for uptake.

**Instructions for using Overall KNOWFOR rubric:**

1. Receive and collate completed rubrics from partners (CIFOR, PROFOR and IUCN).
2. Review assessments made in each rubric referring to the evidence to support ratings in the Annual Review. If necessary, clarify ratings in consultation with partners.
3. Make a performance judgement for ‘uptake’ (Level Two and Three) and ‘effective project design’ (Level One) separately. Compile separate performance ratings for ‘uptake’ and ‘effective project design’ for each partner. If partner performance ratings do not conform to criteria make a judgement on overall performance for the rating that best fits and represents.
4. Make an overall performance judgement for ‘uptake’ and ‘effective project design’ combined. Again, if the ratings do not conform to the criteria (i.e. ‘Above average’ for ‘Effective project design’ and ‘Below average’ for ‘Uptake’), make an overall rating based on what best fits (either by averaging or through a discretionary judgement, supported by a clear rationale and evidence).
5. Complete the ratings in the ‘Performance Summary Table’ for each organisation at each successive year.

Repeat steps in successive years as required.
**Targets**

Using the standardised output categories described in Section 3.2 of the overarching framework, partners will report against the following targets:

- # of knowledge products and range of categories (of which at least 25% either explicitly respond to the specific needs of women and girls or generates sex differentiated knowledge)
- # and range of KNOWFOR supported engagement process/events (workshops, forums, meetings etc.)
- # and type of products accessed (downloads, distributed etc)
- # of participants at KNOWFOR supported events/ processes (disaggregated by gender).

Additionally, targets are set in relation to collaboration (Level 1.3). In this area the programme is interested in seeing an increase in:

- # of interactions where partners planned activities for mutual benefit or a common purpose (e.g KNOWFOR partnership planning meetings, cross-institute management meetings discussing shared systems or joint opportunities, cross-institute meetings to discuss current or future shared work)
- # of joint events (e.g events where partners bi-laterally or multi-laterally co-developed or co-delivered content, events that were jointly hosted or funded by at least two partners. NB does not include events where partners were all present but had no specific shared agenda)
- # of jointly developed products (e.g. co-authored publications, jointly developed tools or methodologies, peer reviews of each other’s work).

These figures will simply be aggregated into the KNOWFOR program logframe.

**2. Evaluation**

DFID will be commissioning an independent evaluation of KNOWFOR in 2015. Section 8 of the M&E framework provides guidance and advice on the appropriate areas for evaluation inquiry and clearly explains how existing M&E data can feed into this piece of work. In summary, however, the KNOWFOR M&E framework (if implemented as planned) should provide a good picture of what has been done to facilitate knowledge uptake, and some indication of whether it helped equip policy and practitioners. External evaluation could therefore usefully focus upon:

- Verifying some of the self-reported results by sampling a small number of projects to cross-check and validate.
- Investigating the value add of KNOWFOR (including but not limited to value for money) by considering the ‘without-project’ scenario and/or the comparative advantage of delivering through the three partners as a single program rather than three separate investments.
- Considering alternative ways the outputs could have been achieved and how KNOWFOR could be more efficient.
- Ascertaining the relevance of KNOWFOR to the development context.
- Investigating lessons learned about how the programme was designed and managed.
- Considering the sustainability and extent to which outcomes achieved are likely to endure beyond the life of the programme.
14. Reporting lessons learned from the investment in M&E and the collaborative approach taken in KNOWFOR.

3. Project Closure

DFID’s internal project closure processes will draw on the consolidated evidence from;

- 2014 and 2015 Annual Reports and
- Independent and partner led evaluations.

Planning for the information needs of this process should coincide with the commissioning of the independent evaluation to ensure that any additional information required is either part of the evaluation process or otherwise commissioned.
Attachment 9: Project managers user guide

DFID is currently providing funding to a partnership programme involving the Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR); the International Union for Conservation of Nature’s Global Program on Forest Landscape Restoration (IUCN) and the World Bank Program of Forests (PROFOR). Titled “Improving the way knowledge on forests is understood and used internationally” the programme is known as KNOWFOR.

KNOWFOR seeks to address the gap between the supply and uptake of knowledge by practitioners and decision makers in the forestry sector by improving the pathways for disseminating knowledge products, tools and advice to policy makers and forestry and land-use practitioners. More specifically, KNOWFOR seeks to equip policy makers and practitioners in developing countries with strategic knowledge, comparable evidence, reliable tools and systematic analysis on forests and climate. Figure 1 illustrates the basic theory of change model for the KNOWFOR programme, showing how the partners work directly and indirectly to equip decision makers (policy makers and practitioners) with the knowledge to implement changes in policy and practice.

Figure 9 KNOWFOR Theory of Change Model
How does M&E work for KNOWFOR?

The work of KNOWFOR is done through a series of projects or initiatives planned for and implemented or overseen by CIFOR, PROFOR and IUCN. Therefore, the outcome of the investment that DFID has made through KNOWFOR is reflected in the aggregate results of all funded projects. The three partners have worked together to develop a monitoring and evaluation framework for KNOWFOR. The framework sets out a system for collecting monitoring data at the project level and using this to reflect on organisation and programme wide performance.

At the project level, the focus of the M&E framework is on monitoring:

14. How projects are designed to maximise knowledge uptake by policy makers and practitioners

15. What knowledge products and dissemination events are being delivered

16. Who is being reached by KNOWFOR knowledge products and knowledge generation processes (i.e. intermediaries and policy makers/practitioners).

What does it mean for me?

Project managers will be required to demonstrate that they are planning their projects in a manner that will maximise knowledge uptake and develop a project level system for monitoring results. Projects will need to report on results annually in a format negotiated by their organisation with DFID. Your project reports will be aggregated along with other reports at the organisation level and reported back to DFID. Organisation and programme wide assessments are facilitated by i) the use of common knowledge product output classifications and associated targets and ii) qualitative scales or rubrics against which organisations assess themselves on key criteria. The flow of information from the project level to the programme wide DFID logframe is demonstrated in Figure 2 below.
In addition to on-going programme monitoring, the KNOWFOR framework provides guidance on the key areas for evaluation focus and how to integrate project monitoring data into future evaluations. For further information on this please refer to the KNOWFOR M&E framework.
What is expected of me?

KNOWFOR is explicitly about increasing knowledge uptake. All projects and initiatives are expected to plan out how they will maximise their uptake and monitor and evaluate this. All KNOWFOR projects will be reviewed at the end of 2016 against 2 sets of standards - one for project design and a second one for knowledge uptake.

Standard for project design:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above expectations</td>
<td>Some of the criteria have been conducted in an exemplary manner, and the all criteria (see below) have been addressed to a reasonable extent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project designs/plans meet expectations</td>
<td>All of the criteria that are relevant to the project have been addressed to a reasonable extent. Criteria are that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The knowledge uptake pathway is clearly articulated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The project has done some work to identify end user information requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Where relevant, partners have been engaged in the project design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The project has an implicit or explicit dissemination plan in place. In the absence of a written plan project managers are able to explain how dissemination is intended to occur. They may be planning to make this explicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The project has been assessed for gender relevance. Where relevant the project plans are proactive about considering the needs of women and girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• An M&amp;E framework for the project has been developed including selection of appropriate M&amp;E tools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard for knowledge uptake:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above expectations</td>
<td>There is evidence that that the majority of targeted audiences (intermediaries and/or end users) have been reached or equipped as articulated in project plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AND EVIDENCE OF ONE OF THE FOLLOWING:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Unanticipated boundary partners are equipped or reached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Knowledge products inform policy debate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Instances of policy being influenced or changed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Instances of practice change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets expectations</td>
<td>There is evidence that that the majority of targeted audiences (intermediaries and/or end users) have been reached or equipped as articulated in project plans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How do I plan for success?

A key way to maximise the chances of your project or event having a positive influence on your intended users is to **plan** this out at the start of your project and be **intentional** about how you go about your project planning and how you will monitor and evaluate. We suggest you follow these steps:

A. Clarify the Knowledge-uptake pathway as part of project planning:
   - Clarify the scope and rationale for your project/event
   - Map out the knowledge uptake pathway
   - Clarify who you are ultimately expecting to influence, and who might be the best intermediaries in this knowledge chain
   - Consider how the project may impact on women and men differently
   - Consider whether you can partner with any other KNOWFOR partners to maximise influence
   - Decide what knowledge products and methods to maximise impact would achieve the most influence of your target audience, and who will develop these.

B. Plan your M&E needs at the start:
   - Who needs M&E data about this project and what will they use it for?
   - What are the key questions we need answered? And are there any associated indicators I need to collect data against
   - How will I answer these questions? What M&E tools should I use

Resources available to help with map out your knowledge-uptake pathway

The overarching KNOWFOR M&E framework includes theory of change models for each organisation. You may be able to use this as a starting point for mapping out how your activity will lead to knowledge uptake. It also includes a list of standard outputs, that you can select from to describe your activities.

Your organisation may also offer specific guidelines and support.

Resources available to help you with M&E

Your organisation may be able to provide you with a simple template for an M&E plan for a project or event. Once you have clarified the purpose, audience and questions for your M&E plan you can select the appropriate tools to collect this data.

The overarching M&E framework offers a “Toolkit” of data collection and synthesis tools to assist project staff collect and manage data if needed. It includes the following templates and protocols for project teams to organise and manage their project data:
   - Influence log
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- Event evaluation templates (Part 1 – 3)
- Trip report template
- Semi-structured interview guides
- Digital media tracking templates
- Output log
- Citation tracking and web-based content tracking protocol

These data collection tools are all designed to be applied as appropriate by project teams throughout the year or in line with key events (e.g. forums and conferences). They will help to avoid the last minute rush at annual reporting time and provide a robust evidence base to help you demonstrate project achievements. The toolkit also includes some tools that are more in depth and help project teams reflect on and share the learning from achievements or successful practices. These include:

- Episode study template
- Performance Story Report guide
- Promising Practice Profile templates (PPPs)
- Case study guide
- Results chart

The relationship between these data collection tools, programme outcomes and performance indicators is summarised in Table 1 below.

KNOWFOR is also needs to tell the story of how gender has been considered and responded to through the programme. Projects will be asked to:

- Demonstrate good practice in gender differentiated planning at the project design stage
- Report on the number of specific knowledge products/engagement processes that either explicitly respond to the specific needs of women and girls or generates sex differentiated knowledge
- Provide sex disaggregated tracking of participation in knowledge production and dissemination activities.

For project specific guidance on what tools are most appropriate for your project, please refer to scenario examples below or contact your KNOWFOR programme manager.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1 Programme outcomes and indicators and data tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Longer term impact</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Poverty reduction, biodiversity conservation, protection of climate and other ecosystem services through improved management of forests and trees. | Instances of improvement at a localised scale that KNOWFOR has contributed towards:  
- Poverty levels amongst poor forest dependent households  
- Area of degraded forest landscapes restored in developing countries  
- Area of deforestation  
- Amount of equivalent tonnes of carbon emissions from avoided deforestation and carbon sequestration from restored forest  
- Externally commissioned secondary data (may include impact evaluations, international monitoring of social, economic and environmental |
| **Shorter term impact** | **Shorter term impact indicator 1** |
| Improvements in forestry related policy and practice | Instances of change in policies or practice in targeted areas  
- Episode study/PSR  
- Influence log |
| **End of programme outcome** | **End of programme outcome indicator 1** |
| Intermediaries and policymakers/ practitioners in developing countries are equipped with strategic knowledge, comparable evidence, reliable tools and systematic analysis on forests, trees and climate. | KNOWFOR is rated as ‘Meeting expectations’ or ‘Above expectations’ in the ‘Uptake’ rubric for Level Three (policymakers and practitioners) at 2016. (The rubric includes criteria such as whether project reached intended intermediaries and end users)  
- Episode study  
- Performance Story Report  
- Event evaluations  
- Digital media tracking  
- Influence log  
- Output log  
- Case studies  
- PPPs  
- Trip report  
- SNA |
| **Output 1.1** | **Output indicator 1.1** |
| KNOWFOR partners generate targeted forest and tree related knowledge products (gender disaggregated) | # of knowledge products and range of categories (of which at least 25% either explicitly respond to the specific needs of women and girls or generates sex differentiated knowledge)  
- Output log |
| **Output indicator 1.2** | **Output indicator 1.3** |
| # and range of KNOWFOR supported engagement process/events | # and type of products accessed  
- Digital media tracking |
| **Output indicator 1.4** | **Output indicator 1.1.2** |
| # of participants at KNOWFOR supported events/processes (disaggregated by gender) | 
- Output log |
| **Output 1.2** | **Output indicator 1.2** |
| KNOWFOR partners have improved understanding of their knowledge of their target audiences and uptake pathways and use those pathways more effectively. | KNOWFOR is rated as ‘Meeting expectations’ or ‘Above expectations’ in the ‘Effective project design’ rubric for Level One at 2016 (rubric includes criteria such as whether project planning included identification of next users and knowledge pathway and the differentiated needs of women and girls)  
- Evidence based self-assessment at the organisational level |
| **Output 1.3** | **Output indicator 1.3** |
| Improved collaboration across KNOWFOR partners. | # of interactions where partners planned activities for mutual benefit or a common purpose  
- Output log |
| **Output indicator 1.3.1** | **Output indicator 1.3.2** |
| # of joint events |
| **Output indicator 1.3.3** | **Output indicator 1.3.4** |
| # of jointly developed products  
- Output log |
## Project scenarios

### Example 1: Event hosted by your organisation

| Step 1: Plan the event and consider the knowledge uptake pathway, collaboration and gender | • Clarify the rationale for holding this event – what outcomes is it intended to contribute towards, what opportunities will it build on?  
• Map out a basic knowledge-uptake pathway showing how your event might contribute to these outcomes  
• Clarify who you are ultimately expecting to influence, and who might be the best people to invite to ensure that they influence this knowledge chain  
• Identify the key organisations and individuals that will help you achieve your outcomes and develop a plan for engaging/reaching them and note that you have done so in the output log.  
• Consider whether there is potential to enhance outcomes by collaborating with KNOWFOR partners – if you do collaborate note this in the output log.  
• Assess how event will be gender responsive and document this in output log. |
|---|---|
| Step 2: Consider M&E at the start! | • Plan out a basic evaluation plan for the event and document it – pose some key questions and consider which are the appropriate tools.  
• Review KNOWFOR event evaluation tools and modify if needed to ensure they will collect the information required against your outcomes. |
| Step 3: Implement | • Collect sex disaggregated attendance statistics and record this in the output log.  
• Monitor social media traffic relating to event using tools provided. |
| Step 4: Collect, compile and interpret all data | • Collect final measures in output log and digital media tracking template.  
• If possible, contact key intermediaries and policy/decision makers after the event and conduct short interviews using/adapting the intermediary/end user interview guides in the semi-structured interview tool.  
• Monitor your networks for any instances of influence on policy/practice as the result of your event and record these in the influence log.  
• If there is evidence of positive outcomes consider documenting these as a mini case-study or episode study.  
• If you trialled any innovative approaches that you would like to highlight or share, compile a Promising Practice Profile (PPP) using toolkit templates.  
• Compile outcomes data in a project specific results chart and reflect on this with your team regarding achievement of outcomes in an evidence based way. Think what you need to do differently next time! |

### Example 2: Project to implementation of an assessment tool in a sub-national region

| Step 1: Plan the process and consider the knowledge uptake pathway, collaboration and gender | • Clarify the rationale for this project – what outcomes is it intended to contribute towards, what opportunities will it build on?  
• Map out a basic knowledge-uptake pathway showing how your project is intended to contribute to these outcomes  
• Clarify who you are ultimately expecting to influence, and who might be the best people to engage with to ensure maximum uptake  
• Identify the key organisations and individuals that will help you achieve your outcomes and develop a plan for engaging/reaching them and note that you have done so in the output log.  
• Consider whether there is potential to enhance outcomes by collaborating with KNOWFOR partners – if you do collaborate note this in the output log.  
• Assess how your project will be gender responsive and document this in output log. |
|---|---|
| Step 2: Consider M&E at the start! | • Plan out a basic evaluation plan for the event and document it – pose some key questions and consider which are the appropriate tools.  
• Review KNOWFOR event evaluation tools and modify if needed to ensure they will collect the information required against your outcomes. |
| Step 3: Implement | • Collect sex disaggregated attendance statistics through-out the process record this in the output log.  
• Monitor engagement with target intermediaries and target audiences and track instances of significant linking/connecting/knowledge transfer or policy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 4: Collect, compile and interpret all data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Contact key intermediaries and policy/decision makers after the event and conduct short interviews using/adapting the intermediary/end user interview guides in the semi-structured interview tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Monitor your networks for any instances of influence on policy/practice as the result of your event and record these in the influence log</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If there is evidence of positive outcomes consider documenting these as a mini case-study or episode study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If you trialled any innovative approaches that you would like to highlight or share, compile a Promising Practice Profile (PPP) using toolkit templates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Compile outcomes data in a project specific results chart and reflect on this with your team regarding achievement of outcomes in an evidence based way</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further information and resources

There are internal and external resources available to assist you conduct effect project planning, monitoring and reporting. Please contact your KNOWFOR programme manager if you would like any further assistance with any of the following:

**Project design and management**

- Assistance in defining outcomes
- Assistance in identification of intermediaries and end users
- Gender relevance assessments
- Assistance in developing project level M&E

**Data collection and management**

- Adapting tools from the M&E toolkit
- Managing data
- Synthesising data and using evidence base to support findings

**Using monitoring data**

Reflection and learning from project monitoring data