

1. Purpose and Contents of this Guide

This guide is intended to facilitate the application of GTZ's operational rule regarding PPR.

In future, project progress will mainly be reviewed by the projects themselves and in response to specific events. Although no longer a regulatory instrument, PPR nevertheless retains certain standards and a few rules that must be adhered to.

This guide summarizes those points that ought to be taken into account, together with those that must be observed when preparing and implementing a PPR. PPRs implemented in the manner described in this guide comply with the professional standards GTZ demands and expects of this instrument.

Chapter 2 defines the PPR instrument and its place in GTZ's quality management. Chapter 3 contains tried-and-tested aids from hands-on implementation: checklists for the preparation and implementation of a PPR, an estimation of the time requirements, a list of frequently observed weak points and a sample of terms of reference for a contract for appraisers/consultants. The structure of the PPR report, which constitutes one of the set rules for GTZ operations, is given in the Annex.

2. The definition of a PPR and its place in quality management

2.1 Purpose

The main focus of a PPR will be on identifying a project's contributions and its development impact; a comparison of the actual situation with the targets is of secondary importance.

Within our overall corporate concept on quality management, PPR is a key element of quality assurance during project implementation. On the surface, this is no different to former times when head office and the commissioning party were mainly interested in finding out whether a project had done what it was commissioned to do during planning.

However, development cooperation takes place under conditions in which the meticulous observance of a plan is no guarantee for success. Today, the willingness to learn and a flexible response to changing circumstances are absolutely indispensable. Quality assurance can no longer rely solely on a comparison of the present situation with planned targets. Even though it is still important to compare a project's current status with planning, the focus needs to shift to project results and impact.

Greater emphasis on evaluating project impact derives from a change in our understanding of quality. In the past, when asked to define quality, our company came up with a whole range of different answers, most of which had an absolute, normative character: quality should be measured against the extent to which poverty has been reduced, the environment has been protected, women have been promoted etc.

In the meantime, such normative-type thinking has given way to the realization that, in the context of development cooperation, we can only achieve what our "clients" consider important themselves. Therefore, by quality we now mean the compliance of our services with what our clients (commissioning parties, partners and target groups) want. Our qual-