


Annex 1 Checklist for assessing the level of complexity of a program							
	Low						High
		Complexity rating					
Components in each dimension		1	2	3	4	5	
<b>Dimension 1: The nature of the Intervention</b>							
	Value	0.5	1	1.5	2	2.5	
1. Objectives	Few and relatively clearly defined						Multiple, broad and often not clearly defined
2. Nature of the problem	Well understood/ high level of agreement						Not well understood/ high level of disagreement
3. Size	Affecting small population						Affecting large population
4. Stability of program design	Relatively stable						Emergent design
5. Implementation procedures	Clearly defined in project design						Often not clearly defined and changing
6. Services or components	Relatively few						Large number
7. Technical complexity	Low						High
8. Social complexity	Low						High
9. Duration	Clear start and end date						No clear end date and sometimes no clear start date
10. Is the program design well tested	Well tested and used many times						Relatively new and untested
	<b>Total dimensions score</b>						
<b>Dimension 2: Interactions among institutions and stakeholders</b>							
	Value	1	2	3	4	5	
11. Budget	The use of the funds is clearly defined						General budget support with no clear definition of services to be funded
12. Funding and implementing agencies	Relatively few						Large number

13. Stakeholders	Relatively few and with similar interests							Many and diverse
14. Consensus on objectives/approach	High level of consensus							Low level of consensus
15. Level of cohesion among stakeholders	High level of cohesion							Low cohesion and/or competition and conflict
	<b>Total dimension score</b>							

Dimension 3: Causality and change								
	Value	1	2	3	4	5		
16. Causal pathways	Single and linear causal pathway							Multiple causal pathways (non-linear, interconnected, recursive feedback loops)
17. Certainty on outcomes	Relatively high degree of certainty							Low degree of certainty
18. Agreement on appropriate actions to address problems	Relatively high agreement							Relatively low agreement
19. Emergence	Program design and implementation relatively stable over time							Program design and implementation experience significant changes over time
20. Processes of behavioral change	behavioral change process simple/easy to measure							Complex and difficult to understand
	<b>Total dimension score</b>							
Dimension 4: Embeddedness and the nature of the system								
	Value	1	2	3	4	5		
21. Agreement on key contextual factors	High level of agreement and factors easy to identify							Disagreement and/or difficult to identify
22. Context and embeddedness	Program relatively independent of context							Contextual factors significantly affect program

23. Interactions among contextual factors	Little interaction among factors						Significant interactions among different factors
24. Stability of program environment	Stable program environment						Unstable and changing program environment
25. Ease of identification of factors	Contextual factors easy to identify and measure						Contextual factors difficult to identify and measure
	<b>Total dimension score</b>						
		TOTAL SCORE					

**How to calculate scores:**

There are a total of 25 items [10 for Dimension 1 and 5 for Dimensions 2,3 and 4]. Each item is rated on the 5 point complexity score ranging from very low to very high complexity. Each Dimension has a maximum score of 25 points so that the maximum possible complexity score is 100 and the minimum is 20. As Dimension 1 has more elements that must be assessed, this dimension has 10 indicators, while the other Dimensions each have 5 indicators. In order to ensure that each Dimension has the same total of 25 points, each indicator for Dimension 1 is only given half the value.

**Steps for calculating the complexity scores**

Step 1: Review each indicator and put a check indicating whether the indicator has a very low, low, medium, high or very high level of complexity.

Step 2: For each dimension the value to be assigned to each position is indicated. For example, a “very low” complexity rating is given a value of “1” for Dimensions 2,3 and 4. Similarly a “very high” complexity rating for these 3 dimensions would be given a value of “5”.

Step 3: As Dimension 1 includes 10 items (compared to 5 for the other dimensions), each value is half of that for the other dimensions. So a rating of “very low” for an indicator of Dimension 1 is only given a value of “0.5” while a rating of “very high” would be given a value of “2.5”

Step 4: For each Dimension add the values for each indicator and put the “total dimension score” in the corresponding box. The minimum possible score for each Dimension is 5, and the maximum is 25.

Step 5: Add the total scores for each dimension and put the total in the “Total Score Box”

Step 6: When interpreting the scores, remember that the scores are combining different kinds of indicators so that the values are ordinal so that the totals only provide a rough estimate and should not be treated as interval variables that can be manipulated statistically

Source: Bamberger, Vaessen and Raimondo (2016) Chapter 1. Bamberger and Raimondo 2018 update for EES Workshop

