

QualDATA Fact Sheet

Key Result Areas (KRA) Table[©]

For effective Monitoring and Evaluation, you need to be very clear about what impact your project or program is attempting to achieve through its activities – and more to the point, what is actually achievable within the time frame!

For this purpose, we distinguish between scientific research as such – for example: ‘A better understanding of nutritional requirements of camels’ – and how this knowledge will be used to change the capacity, practices and outcomes for camel producers and their industry. The former is a *research output* and the latter is a ‘*Key Result Area*’ (KRA) - or impact outcome of the research work. The research may be essential to achieving the program outcomes. The need is to think beyond the research or underpinning knowledge to how it will be used and by whom.

KRAs = What you have promised to deliver on in the time frame of your project/program - what changes in capacity and/or practice change with what proportion of which group leading to what level of impact or benefit?

The challenge is to be as specific as you can without putting your project or program in such a straight jacket that it becomes inflexible – KRAs can be revisited and renegotiated as a project or program proceeds!

To help in developing your KRAs, we have developed the following table and provided an example of what we mean.

Imagine that you are working on this ‘Improving Camel Nutrition’ Project (illustration only – not a real project) and are seeking to develop your impact KRAs. The main focus is better understanding the nutritional needs of camels to maximize their performance and so improve the profitability of camel production in the Territory. The project runs over 3 years.

The table below will help you to think about the short term impacts (KRAs) that you aim to achieve.

QualDATA Key Result Area (KRA) Development Table[©]

Issue	Details [Example – Camel Nutrition Project]
Geographical Area	The Northern Territory
Target group/total	The 10 major camel producers between Alice Springs and Katherine – totalling 120,000 adult camel equivalents; and the 3 government agency staff involved in supporting the nutritional aspects of the industry
Awareness target	All of the identified producers and government staff aware of the project and the broad findings of the research.
Engagement target	Half of the producers and all agency staff attend a series of 3 workshops on how to improve the feeding program for their stock.

KASA targets (Knowledge, Attitude, Skills and Aspirations)	Half of the producers being skilled in preparing the improved diets – and all of the agency people fully able to advise/provide on-going training - believing that this is good practice, and wanting to implement the improvements.
P1 Targets (eg incentives)	Four producers take up the offered industry development incentives to buy improved feed mixing equipment.
P2 Targets (eg practice change)	Three producers – managing a total of 50,000 adult camel equivalents – implement the improved feeding recommendations by the end of the 3 year project.
Impact: productivity	Producers implementing the feeding changes will have demonstrated (in practice or the potential of) increased productivity by 20% per head of stock over a 12 month period.
Impact: economics	The changes will result in an increased profitability (after increased feed costs are considered) of \$50/head of camel per year.
Impact: environment	The improved feeding will result in reduced pressure on grazing of marginal plants – increasing ground cover of affected plants by 30%
Impact : social	The improved viability of the industry will result in more stability and returns and an improved lifestyle of camel producers and their families.

Having teased out your KRAs in this table, they can be converted to a summary format for your program logic/MERI log frame:

Project

Improving Camel Nutrition

Key Result Area (KRA)

In general: This project aims to improve the productivity, profitability and sustainability of camel properties in the Northern Territory through improved nutritional practices.

Targeted impacts *by the end of the 3 years of the project* include:

- [Capacity changes] Having all 10 producers and the 3 agency staff supporting the industry aware of the project and the broad findings with half of the producers and all agency staff understanding the importance of improved nutrition, having the skills to make recommended changes and wanting to implement these;
- [Practice changes] With at least 4 producers taking up productivity incentives to install new mixing equipment and at least 3 of these (covering 50,000 camels) implementing the recommendations
- [Benefits] Resulting in (or indications of the potential): increased productivity of at least 20%/head (50,000 camels); increased profitability of at least \$50/head (or total of \$2.5m); with improved ground cover (from an average of 10 to 30%) on the implementing properties; and more sustainable and stable industry.

In some cases, you may not be able to be as specific about numbers, percentages or dollars – and you may need to use words like ‘increased number/amount/return/groundcover’ etc. But the challenge is to be as specific as you can – to both help guide the project and monitor its progress – and to target your evaluation processes.

For example, based on the above KRAs, then you can have processes in place to capture data about levels of awareness in the defined group of people, the number who increased skills, took up incentives and incorporated recommendations. You also know you need to have processes in place to be able to link such changes to productivity, profitability, ground cover and social benefits (and costs). Compare this to the more general statement of *“improve the productivity, profitability and sustainability of camel properties in the Northern Territory through improved nutritional practices”* which doesn’t have such boundaries – making it so much more difficult to target and evaluate impact.

It is good to achieve good scientific outputs, tools and practices – but unless you can demonstrate how this will impact in practice, then you may not be able to continue to compete for funding in industries and communities where they are looking for value for money and measurable improvement.

Impacts that will continue after the end of the project will be captured under ‘Longer term impacts’ and are important to also articulate when completing an evaluation – or in structuring a Benefit-Cost analysis. But that is for discussion in another place!

Jeff Coutts, QualDATA 2010©



PO Box 7642 Toowoomba, Qld, Aust, MC 4352 | 07 4615 2255/ 07 4630 1297 | www.qualifiedata.net.au