Guidelines for collection, management and analysis of IP M&E data

	Key indicators	Frequency of Monitoring	Tools used	Suggested Analysis
IP establishment	Process documentation of the establishment of the IPs	During the initial stages of IP formation	IP establishment protocol (Tool 1. IP Establishment ProtocolTool 1)	**Descriptive analys**is of the methods and comparisons used to establish IPs from the pre formation stage to the actual establishment
	A common objective, issues are being addressed and roles are well defined	At the establishment and at the end of each production season	IP establishment protocol (**Error! Not a valid bookmark self-reference.**) IP member evaluation (Tool 5Tool 5)	**Statistical analysis** of mean scores for the different satisfaction levels for each attribute that is being assessed by the stakeholder
	Inclusiveness/representativeness of the IP	At the beginning of the formation of the IP and subsequently updated every year.	IP registers (Tool 2Tool 2b)	**Trend analysis** of the types and number of members and actors attending analyzed by gender from Every IP meeting.
IP Functioning	Frequency of participation of the IP actors	After every activity	IP register (Tool 2b)	**Trend analysis** of the types and number of members and actors attending analyzed by gender from every IP meeting.
	Quality and process of IP organized activities	After every activity	Activity report (Tool 2Tool 2a) and After Action Review (Tool 2c)	**Descriptive and comparison analysis** of the type, processes of IP organized activities e.g. establishment, IP workplan development, collective action, etc used across the different categories of IPs.
	Number and types of knowledge sharing channels Number of males and females being reached by the information	At the establishment of the platform and every year	Inventory of knowledge sharing tools (Tool 4)	**Descriptive analysis** of the number of knowledge sharing mechanisms and the number of livestock owners using the different types of information.
	Actor perceptions of the formation, functioning and outcomes of the innovation platform	At the establishment of the platform and every year	IP member evaluation tool (Tool 5)	**Statistical analysis** of mean scores for the different satisfaction levels for each attribute that is being assessed by the stakeholder
	Changes in the knowledge and skills of the stakeholders in relation to identified needs	After every training activity held at IP level	Training evaluation form (Tool 3)	**Trend analysis** of the assessment scores of the different trainings that are conducted across the groups. Number of members and actors attending analyzed by gender from Every IP meeting.
IP outcomes	Changes in interactions among the IP actors and/or their organizations as a result of their participation in the IP	At the formation of the IP and at the end of each year	Stakeholder Interactions (Tool 6)	**Social network analysis:** Changes of stakeholder types and composition in each site and information flows and knowledge sharing from and to IP stakeholders
	Perception of coordination and performance of the project	At the end of each IP cycle	Most Significant Change (Tool 7)	**Thematical analysis** of the most significant change stories and anecdotes about the benefits of the participating in the IPs at the community PROGEBE, actor and IP level
	Changes in the knowledge attitude and practices of ERL technologies	At the end of each cycle of the IP	KAP Survey – Tool with site specific IP characteristics to be developed by in collaboration with NCU	**Analysis:** Assessment of IP members Knowledge, attitudes and practices on ERL production and management characteristics

Tool 1. IP Establishment Protocol

Country: _____ District: _____

Location: _____ Name of Innovation Platform: _____

Name of Facilitator: _____

Level at which activity is held: Regional [____] National [___] Site [_____]

Characteristic	Levels	Category where IP falls	Remarks/Explain
How has the IP been formed (Origin)	IP started from scratch		
	IP builds on existing networks (e.g local steering committee)		
	IP already fully existed		
What is the structure of the IP	Structured with elaborate procedures for running the IP		Indicate structures of the IP e.g sub committees, IP executive committee in place etc
	Not structured		
Facilitation	Facilitated by PROGEBE		
	Facilitated by other local stakeholders		
	Joint / Alternating facilitation		
Commons Objective / Issues	Have common issue/ objective being addressed		If yes, what is the common issue / objective[1]
	Do not have a common issue / objective being addressed		
Information sharing mechanisms	Have clear information sharing mechanisms been identified		If yes, give list of information sharing mechanisms that have been agreed on

NOTES FOR THE USE OF the IP establishment protocol

---

[1] If there is no common objective of the platform list all objectives as outlined by the platform members.

When used: This tool is to be used only once in the lifetime of the IP during the IP establishment phase.

Who uses: The site co-ordinator is responsible to collection of data for this tool. Once all the innovation platforms have been established, the content of the tool can be synthesized to generate site level comparisons in which innovation platforms were established in a report format. This information should be passed on to the national co-ordination unit for national level comparisons. During the initial participatory assessment of the IP outcomes, the analyses of the methods of IP establishment should be shared with the platform members of each site.

Tool 2. Activity Report, Register of Participants, and After Action Review

PART A: ACTIVITY REPORT

I: DESCRIPTION OF THE ACTIVITY

What is the nature of the activity?

a. Capacity building / Training exercise ☐
b. IP meeting ☐
c. Field activity ☐
d. RCU activity (Specify) ☐ Specify which activity _____

e. NCU activity (Specify) ☐ Specify which activity _____

f. SCU activity (Specify) ☐ Specify which activity _____

g. Reflection meeting ☐
h. Other activity ☐ Specify which activity _____

What were the objectives of the activity **(Please explain the activity and why it was held)**?

Who organized/ originated the activity

Date of the activity _____

II: PARTICIPATION BY IP ACTORS IN THE ACTIVITY (ATTACH IP REGISTER FOR VERIFICATION)

Number of organisations or actors grouped by the type of organisation	Number
Number of male farmers	
Number of female farmers	
Number of researchers	
Number of extension organisations	

Number of policy organizations (including local organizations)	
Number of NGO's	
Number of farmer groups represented	
Number of private sector organisations	
Number of other groups and specify (e.g cattle herders, etc)	

III: PROCESS USED

What means of communication was used to organize this activity? **(PLEASE specify the different communication methods used to congregate stakeholders.)**

IV: RESULTS OF THE ACTIVITY

What were the immediate results of the activity?
1.
2.
3.

PART B: REGISTER OF PARTICIPANTS

Row	Name of the member	Sex	Name of Organization	Type of organisation (Research, Extension, NGO, Private, Policy, Farmers association)	Major role or contribution to IP	Telephone contact
1						
2						
3						
4						

Row	Name of the member	Sex	Name of Organization	Type of organisation (Research, Extension, NGO, Private, Policy, Farmers association)	Major role or contribution to IP	Telephone contact
5						
6						
7						
8						
9						
10						
11						
12						
13						
14						
15						

PART C: AFTER ACTION REVIEW

To be done with all the stakeholders involved in the activity

What did you plan to do during this activity?
1.
2.
3.
What worked well during the activity?
1.
2.
3.
What did not work well during the activity?
1.
2.
3.
How well was the activity co-ordinated **(Communication, Content, process, time management, communication, diversity of actors etc)**
1
2
3
What needs to be changed for the next activity?
1.
2.
3.

What the action points are for follow up?	**Date by when the action points should have been followed up**	**Name of person responsible for ensuring follow up**	**Resources required**	**Who to provide resources**
1.				
2.				
3.				

NOTES FOR THE USE OF THIS TOOL

- **When used:** The activity report should be used by the Facilitator of each activity relating to the IP. At the end of the meeting, the organizer of the meeting or activity should do the after action review (part c) with stakeholders who have been involved in the activity. The after action review should also be done at the end of the IP cycle to decide on key areas that need to be improved in the running of the IP.
- **Who uses:** Once completed, the information contained in the tool should be shared (orally and in written form) with other IP members at the subsequent meetings for their reactions to the content of the meeting. These reactions should be documented as notes on the tools after which it should be shared with the NCU for further content processing to generate a descriptive and content analysis of the type and processes of IP organized activities of each site. The NCU should share the completed tools with the RCU and ILRI and with the platform member at the end of the IP cycle assessments that are conducted on an annual basis. The actual proceedings of the meeting should be documented using minutes and used with the activity report and register of actors.

Tool 3. Training Evaluation Form[2]

Country: District:

Site: Name of innovation platform

Name(s) of the training facilitator(s)   Type of Training

Date of the training

Aspects of training to be evaluated	On a score of 0-5, 5 being the maximum, how would you rate the following aspects	Comments or reasons for the score
General aspects of training		
Have you learnt new skills from the training		
Usefulness of the training to your activities		
Timeliness of the training (Training was given at the time you needed it)		
Technical content of the training		
Methods used in the training		
Competence of the trainers		
Specify topics on which you were trained	**Level of skills before (0-5)**	**Level of ne knowledge after training (on a score of 0-5)**

---

[2] A Knowledge Attitude and Practice survey will be conducted at the baseline, mid and end of term of the IPs to assess the changes in the Knowledge attitude and practices as a results of stakeholder interaction and formal training

When used: This tool should be used for each IP training activity and should be given to every training participant to fill in.

Who uses: Each training participants of the meeting to fill in the tool. The training facilitator should generate analyses of the satisfaction of the training by the participants and hand over the information to the NCU who would make an assessment of the number of participants trained the frequency with which each participant is trained, the content of training etc. This information should be analysed and shared with the platform member during the assessments at the end of the IP cycle.

Tool 4. Inventory of Knowledge Sharing Mechanisms

Country: District:

Site: Name of Innovation Platform:

Name of Facilitator:

Date:

Inventory of Knowledge Sharing Mechanisms

Methods for information and knowledge sharing	Numbers produced or available	What information is being shared	Number of partners accessing	Number of partners using/utilizing	What is the estimated research or potential reach amongst partners and farmers	
					Number of male farmers	Number of female farmers

			13			

When used: This tool should be used at the beginning and end of the IP cycle which may be a season.

Who uses: This tool should be filled in by the IP facilitator with input from other stakeholders in a group discussion. This information needs to be shared with the platform members for validation purposes.

Tool 5. IP Member Evaluation Tool

Country: District: Site:

Name of Innovation Platform: Name of actor doing the evaluation:

Activity: Date:

Period of IP cycle being assessed

	On a score of 0-5, 5 being the maximum, what score would you give the IP with respect to:	Comments or reasons for the score
Your level of awareness and understanding of the critical issue being addressed by the IP		
Extent to which these issues are relevant for you or how important is it for you to address the issue		
How well was the IP facilitation done?		
How well the IP meetings and activities were organised		
How participatory the activities or discussions were		
Information sharing within the IP		
Extent to which you have felt involved or engaged in the activities of the IP		
Were there any conflicts experience in the IP?		
Conflict resolution strategies used within the IP		
Extent to which you were involved in contributing to the decisions and design of the research		
Extent to which the research done was useful for you		
Whether the plans of the IP have been clearly articulated		
Extent to which the goals have been achieved		
Extent to which you think the IP activities are well co-ordinated		

When used: This tool should be used at the end of the IP cycle. This can be filled in together with the IP evaluation tool, the stakeholder interaction tool and the after action review tool

Who uses: Each participant of the meeting shall fill in the tool

Tool 6. Stakeholder Interaction Tool

Country: District:

Site: Name of Innovation Platform:

Name of actor doing the evaluation: Activity:

Internal and External organisations

Name of stakeholder	Full name of your organization	Other individuals, organizations you are working with	Type of organization (community based organisations, farmer organisations, research, NGO, Govt department, input dealers, traders etc)	Type of activities you are involved in jointly

When used: At the beginning and end of each IP cycle

Who uses: All actors in the IP

Tool 7. The Most Significant Change

Country: District: Site:

Name of Innovation Platform: Name of stakeholder group:

Date:

Domain of change	MSC at IP actor level	MSC at IP Level	MSC at PROGEBE level	MSC at community level

When used: At the beginning (pre IP establishment) to determine the change as a result of the project activities before the establishment of the innovation platforms and end of each IP cycle.

Who uses: All actors in the IP, and subsequently the same actors need to fill in the tool for comparison purposes.