

Guidelines for preparing the PPMs

The following guidelines were used when preparing the Project Planning Matrices (PPMs):

1. Indicators: In order to be useful for monitoring and evaluation purposes, indicators have to be SMART, where SMART refers to an objective or target being defined in such a way as to be **S**pecific; **M**easurable (either quantitatively or qualitatively); **A**ppropriate; **R**ealistic; and **T**ime-bound. The term is sometimes expanded to SMARTER when adaptive management frameworks are employed, referring to SMART + Evaluate and Re-evaluate.
2. Indicators have only been formulated as SMART targets at the “*Overall Outcome*” and “*Management Outcome*” levels, whereas Indicators at the “*Appropriate Management Action*” level have not. This is because the latter levels requires actual knowledge of what specific management action/project activity is going to be undertaken and this can only be defined if and when funding has been secured for one or more of the listed actions/activities. If and when projects are funded, specific SMART indicators should be developed and the PPMs updated accordingly (particularly for the project level PPMs). The higher-level indicators have been defined as these are intended for use to develop annual/biannual scorecards.
3. Assumptions were tested in the following way for applicability:
 - Will the external factor(s) underlying the assumption have a major effect on the project if it/they eventuate (is it/they important)?
 - No – Not included in PPM.
 - Yes.
 - Will it eventuate?
 - Very unlikely – Not included in PPM.
 - Likely – Include as an assumption.
 - Almost certainly – Is it possible to redesign the project in order to influence the external factor(s) underlying the assumption?
 - Yes – Redesign the project by adding activities or results and/or reformulate the project purpose if necessary.
 - No – The project is not feasible.
4. PPMs were checked against the following checklist for consistency and applicability:
 - the vertical logic is complete and accurate;
 - indicators and sources of verification are accessible and reliable;
 - the pre-conditions are realistic;
 - the assumptions are realistic and complete;
 - the risks are acceptable;
 - the likelihood of success is reasonable strong;
 - quality issues have been taken into account and, where appropriate, translated into activities, results or assumptions; and
 - the benefits justify the costs.
5. In all cases, it is assumed that funding is available, although it is acknowledged that this funding is not yet sourced in most cases.