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It answers questions of are we implementing as we planned.

M & E

Generic logic model which shows linkages between a program’s objectives all the way to its impacts.

- **Goals**
- **Objectives**
- **Activities/inputs**
- **Planned outputs**
- **Expected outcomes**
- **Expected impact**

Focus of monitoring (ongoing)

Focus of evaluation (one-time)

- **e.g. to research and apply feasible interventions at retail**
- **or deliverables**

- **It answers questions of e.g. are we implementing as we planned**

- **It answers questions: have we make things better e.g. to improve food safety in Cambodia**
Outputs versus outcomes

**Outputs**: achieved immediately after implementing an activity

- **Retailers and other groups**
  - No. of trainees under SFFF e.g.
    - Retailers 233 (133 male and 90 female)
    - TOT retail 23 (17 male and 5 female)
  - Training and communication materials (booklet, poster, video)
  - Improved Knowledge of retailers

- **Researchers, risk assessors etc.**
  - Number of trainees under SFFF e.g.
    - Risk assessment: 30 (21 male, 9 female)
    - In depth parasite diagnostics 2 (1 male & 1 female)
Outputs versus outcomes

**Outcomes:** more medium- to long-term changes

- **Retailers**
  - demonstrating safer food safety outcomes (trial group)
  - promoting new approaches to other retailers – scalability

- **Researchers**
  - Risk based approaches integrated into daily work, curricula or regulations
  - PHD and MSc students
    - PhD (1) qualitative and/or quantitative risk assessments
Why does monitoring and evaluating outcomes matter?

- To document project successes and why they happened
  - other groups may learn from our experience e.g., FSTFRA in Vietnam and versus versa

- To inform donors of project progress
  - Related to set up objectives and deliverables

- To help secure future funding
  - Based on positive evaluation evidence
What are ways to monitor outcomes? 1/2

**Outcome Harvesting** (Wilson-Grau 2012)
- **Works backward**, starting with the outcome, to determine how the program contributed to the observed change

**Outcome Mapping** (IDRC 2001)
- An approach for **planning, monitoring, and evaluating** development programming/ projects (begins right at the start of project)
SFFF – vision, mission & boundary partners

**Vision** (large scale change we like to achieve)
Consumers health has been improved in the future through reduced risks of FBD from Animal Sourced Food (ASF) in Cambodia

**Mission** (aligned to objective & to support vision)
By building capacity of national partners and generating evidence on the risk of FBD in Cambodia, we will pilot and deliver appropriate interventions to improve hygienic standards among pork and poultry retailers, most of them are female, and thus improve food safety. Provided evidence on risk and mitigation of FBD will be used to inform policy makers for further action.

**Boundary partners:** (groups we want to influence)
Researchers/risk accessors, retailers & policy makers
OM aims to outline expected outcomes and strategies to achieve them & will help us develop / validate a Theory of Change.

A Theory of Change is a visual representation linking outcomes to activities and helps explain HOW and WHY a change is expected to come about.

Simply said, it helps to illustrate the outcome pathway of SFFF and improves the likelihood of program success.
Theory of Change for safer food in Cambodia.
(Oct 2019)

- Developed in a TOC workshop
- 23 participants from Government, NGOs, Academia, international organizations

Usually updated/modified during the project course.
Theory of Change for safer food in wet markets

Reduce the burden of foodborne disease in Cambodia

Traders adopt food safety intervention packages

1. Market inspection and monitoring
2. Introduce proper storage facilities and equipment
3. Training on proper food handling and personal protective equipment
4. Introduction of labeling

- Orientation about food safety issues and safe handling practices
- Develop standard operating procedures and training materials with traders

Assumption 1: Traders are attracting more consumers; consumers demand safer meat; traders are motivated following incentives; socio-economic-cultural factors and traders' businesses do not pose significant barriers to adoption.

Assumption 2: Consumers recognize and demand brand/certification for pork and chicken; traders recognize the usefulness of labelling.

Usually updated/modified during the project course.
Qualitative study exploring post-project impacts

Approach:
- Qualitative interviews with SFFF team members
- Qualitative interviews with program participants (some, purposively selected)

Expected output: Information on project impact after closing e.g. after 6 months
Manuscript

Interviewer/lead: Steven Lam, M&E expert

Proposed timeline: Ethical clearance requested
Further details “to be confirmed”, expected to be done in 2021
Some key facts contributing to impact

**Capacity building impacts:**

**22 short term training courses with nearly 400 trained** actors (retailers, risk accessors/researchers...)

- Hygienic improvement, risk assessment, system modelling & gender

**Long term training:**

PhD (2), MSc & undergraduates

**Food safety impacts:**

**12 markets and 180 retailers** (trial group) across 6 province with **improved food safety outcome**

**Policy impacts**

Through the food safety /Risk Assessment Taskforce

**Scientific impacts:** Peer reviewed papers (3 published and 8 under review), thesis (8)
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