

## **Intertwining Participation, Rights Based Approach and Log-Frame: A way forward in Monitoring and Evaluation for Rights Based Work.**

**Partha Hefaz Shaikh<sup>1</sup>**

Programme implementation through Rights Based Approach (RBA) in ActionAid Bangladesh started in 2000 and it took us quite a while to understand what it meant to implement programmes in a RBA environment. Side by side we were also grappling with issues of monitoring and evaluation of programmes implemented through a rights based approach. In order to develop a more meaningful framework that has all the elements of participation, RBA and log-frame we developed what we call “Planning and Implementation Framework Analysis (PIFA)”. It has the following characteristics that makes it apart from the typical log-frame and has elements of RBA and participation built into it.

Looking at our work through RBA and trying to put it into a log-frame, we found that log-frame will not able to serve the purpose of being a guiding framework for monitoring and evaluation. It starts with the basic historical connotations of log-frames (i.e. an understanding between two sides i. Donor, ii. Recipient) has. We in ActionAid do not see ourselves as donor and we do not promote donor-recipient relationship. We needed to bring a change in the way that log-frames are developed. Furthermore, problem analysis that the log-frame is based upon, in most cases is done in a “Service delivery i.e. need based” approach/mode as opposed to “Rights based mode” of implementation<sup>2</sup>. Thus missing the vital link and question as to what needs to be done in “rights based” mode of implementation. In particular analyzing a problem in a service mode tends not to take people’s rights from the duty bearers (State), market forces and civil society. Furthermore working in rights based work sometimes induces us to change activities i.e. tactics in the implementation process, which does not mean that we will not achieve the expected output [as the vertical logic will not hold] thus the outcome/impact of the programme, but it merely means that we are going through a different route to achieve the outcome or impact and according to us does not hamper the vertical logic of the log-frame.

This change also necessitates that we look at PIFA at the start of the each planning period, take a stock of the last years activities and change / modify / review the activities for this year, while keeping the outcome and impact in mind, and decide on the best route to reach the outcome and impact. This strengthens the vertical logic [and also the horizontal logic] of “Activity – Output – Outcome – Impact”. And this furthermore makes PIFA more dynamic, flexible and learning oriented. Which in the typical log-frame is very difficult to do.

We also wanted to brake/challenge the myth that log-frames are to be developed by the “Log-frame experts” and were trying to make the development of such a framework participatory, involving the partner organizations staff and participants<sup>3</sup>. We went through a process where the partner staff and participants developed the PIFA for their programme through a workshop. Thus ensuring the interfacing of participation and PIFA.

---

<sup>1</sup> Partha Hefaz Shaikh is working as Coordinator, Monitoring and Evaluation Unit, ActionAid Bangladesh.

E-mail: [partha.shaikh@actionaid.org](mailto:partha.shaikh@actionaid.org) This is initial write up on this and will be updated as we learn by doing.

<sup>2</sup> It is not that cause-effect relationship in respect to RBA cannot be incorporated in log-frames. But the nature of the projects, i.e. of short duration, mostly compels project designers to focus on more needs based approach than rights based approach, where more lengthy involvement is needed, which AA has with their DA partners. Thus the opportunity is there to learn and modify the work as we go on implementing.

<sup>3</sup> We acknowledge that, we were not able to ensure the participation of the people that we work for at this initial stage.

We felt that we need to acknowledge that working in rights based approach entails “risks” rather than assumptions. So, in order to analysis and recognize the risks involved in implementing programmes through the RBA, we felt that we need incorporate “Risk analysis” column to induce implementers to look for risk mitigating measures rather than "Assumptions".

We also felt that we need to clarify which programme participants and other stakeholders we need to work with or influence to achieve the “output-outcome-impact” of the programme. So, we have added a column, where we clarify the programme participants and other stakeholders that we need to work with or influence.

As ActionAid Bangladesh works with its long-term partners for a period of at least 7-10 years, we have also broken down the outcome level of the PIFA to a three year period while keeping the impact/goal level on a 7-10 year scale. This also provides the implementers opportunity to look at their achievements on a three-year scale and plan the best route to achieve the impact.

With all these, the PIFA is a matrix of five column and four rows and looks like following:

**Planning & Implementation Framework Analysis (PIFA):**

Narrative Summary	Measure of Achievement [i.e. OVIs in log-frame]	Means of measurements / Accountability Standards [	Programme Partners, Participants, other stakeholders	Risk Analysis
<b>Goal / Impact:</b>				
<b>Purpose / Outcome:</b>				
<b>Output:</b>				
<b>Activities:</b>				

	Activities	Input (Budget)			
		1 <sup>st</sup> qrt	2 <sup>nd</sup> qrt	3 <sup>rd</sup> qrt	4 <sup>th</sup> qrt
<b>1<sup>st</sup> Year</b>					
<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Year</b>					
<b>3<sup>rd</sup> Year</b>					