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Monitoring and Evaluation
What is Monitoring and Evaluation?

The OECD defines monitoring and evaluation as follows:

**MONITORING** is a continuous function that uses the systematic collection of data on specified indicators to provide management and the main stakeholders of an ongoing development intervention with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of objectives and progress in the use of allocated funds.

**EVALUATION** is the systematic and objective assessment of an ongoing or completed project, program, or policy, including its design, implementation, and results. The aim is to determine the relevance and fulfillment of objectives, development efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability. An evaluation should provide information that is credible and useful, enabling the incorporation of lessons learned into the decision making process of both recipients and donors.
What is being monitored?

• Measures of achievement that are aligned to results
  – inputs (finance, resources, in-kind),
  – activities (planned, completed),
  – outputs (directly, or through indicators),
  – outcomes (through indicators)
Why monitor?

- What gets monitored is more likely to get done.
- To demonstrate successes and to identify failures for necessary course correction.
- To ensure accountability of resources and commitments.
- To generate support and credibility for actions and results.
- To see consistencies or discrepancies between planned and actual achievements.
Why evaluate?

– Understand what works and why
– Highlight intended and unintended results
– Impact on stakeholders
– Generate evidence on the achievement of results and institutional performance
– Accountability (internal/external) and development effectiveness
– Build knowledge and organizational learning.
M&E are complementary, however with distinct functions

• Without monitoring, evaluation cannot be done well.
• Evaluation uses additional data collection and analysis methods.
• An evaluation of a program will often lead to changes in program plans.
• Evaluation assesses results at all levels of the results chain

M&E are strategically approached if contribution to development is explicitly linked to purpose and scope of each function.
Complementary Roles of Monitoring and Evaluation

• **Monitoring**
  – Clarifies program objectives
  – Links activities and their resources to objectives
  – Translates objectives into performance indicators and sets targets and baseline
  – Routinely collects data on these indicators, compares actual results with targets
  – Reports progress to managers and alerts them to problems

• **Evaluation**
  – Analyzes why intended results were or were not achieved
  – Assesses specific causal contributions of activities to results
  – Examines implementation process
  – Explores unintended results
  – Provides lessons, highlights significant accomplishment or program potential, and offers recommendations for improvement
**M&E are complementary, however with distinct functions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Monitoring</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency</strong></td>
<td>Periodic, Regular</td>
<td>Episodic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Action</strong></td>
<td>Keeping track</td>
<td>Interpretation, judgement, forward looking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basic Purpose</strong></td>
<td>Improve progress in implementation, efficiency, adjust work plan</td>
<td>Improve relevance, effectiveness, impact, future programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Horizon</strong></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Long term, beyond scope of specific intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus in Programming Cycle</strong></td>
<td>Inputs, process, outputs</td>
<td>Also outcomes and impacts - Contribution to broader development results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>References for comparison</strong></td>
<td>Work plans, performance targets and reference indicators</td>
<td>Objectives and strategy, as well as more widely accepted benchmarks and standards, such as human rights, organizational policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information Sources</strong></td>
<td>Routine or sentinel systems, field observation, progress reports, rapid assessments</td>
<td>Same, plus specific surveys, studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undertaken by</strong></td>
<td>Program managers, community workers, primary stakeholders, supervisors, donors</td>
<td>Same, if approach is participatory, plus external evaluators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reporting to</strong></td>
<td>Program managers, community workers, primary stakeholders, supervisors, donors</td>
<td>Same, if approach is participatory, plus policy-makers, wider range of external stakeholders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Results Chain/Framework (or Theory of Change)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>RESULTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inputs</td>
<td>Outputs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Financial, human, and material resources → Tasks and actions undertaken to transform inputs to outputs → Products and services produced → Intermediate effects on clients → Long-term improvement in society
Results Chain (a.k.a. Theory of Change)

A representation of how a project/program/policy initiative is expected to lead to the outcomes and impacts

Identifies the underlying assumptions being made with respect to how the change will occur
RESULTS-BASED MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEM

Results Frameworks at National/Sectoral/Regional (Spatial) and Organizational (Agency) and Programs/Projects Level

Energizers Pillars of RBME

Methodology: Analytical Tools and Methods for Planning and Implementation (M&E)

Organizational Systems, Processes and Resources

Database

HUMAN FACTOR CAPACITY AND LEADERSHIP COMMITMENT

IMPACT
OUTCOME
OUTPUTS
MAJOR ACTIVITIES
Overview of Tools and Techniques in LogFrame Formulation

SITUATION ANALYSIS
- Participants/Stakeholders Analysis
- Problem/Constraints/Deficiency Analyses
- Objectives/Potentials Analysis
- Analysis of Alternatives/Options

LOGICAL FRAMEWORK FORMULATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>MEANS OF VERIFICATION</th>
<th>ASSUMPTIONS/ RISKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTCOME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTPUTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTIVITIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PREPARATORY ANALYSIS

P

ANALYSIS AND SUMMARY OF OBJECTIVES AND INTERVENTIONS

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN/WFPs

Areas for Quantitative Evaluation
- With direct comparison
  - Impact
    - Contribution to strategy/programme
    - Lessons Learnt
  - Measurement
    - Analysis
    - Reporting
    - Conclusions
    - Recommendations
  - Implementation
    - Project delivery

Areas for Qualitative Evaluation
- Without direct comparison
  - Contribution to Strategy and Programme
  - DAC criteria
  - Unforeseen + - consequences
  - Assumptions and risks
  - Stakeholders’ record and responses

Project and M&E Design
- Logframe
- Objectives
- Indicators
- Evidence
- Activities
- Budget
- Management structure

Planning
- Strategy and Programme
- Stakeholders’ Record
- Problems and Objectives Analysis
How does a typical logical framework look like?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives (1)</th>
<th>Indicators (2)</th>
<th>Means of Verification (3)</th>
<th>Important Assumptions (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTCOME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTPUTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>Specification of inputs/costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Logical framework provides a summary of the planned development interventions and contains the following information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why</th>
<th>a development intervention is carried out or who/what will benefit? (Impact)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What</td>
<td>the development intervention is expected to achieve in terms of utilization of services and goods (Outcome)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How</td>
<td>the interventions at output level are to be executed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which</td>
<td>external factors are crucial for the success of the intervention or what are the risks and frame conditions (Assumptions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How</td>
<td>we can assess success in terms of Indicators (Indicators)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where</td>
<td>we will find the data required to assess the success (Means of verification)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which</td>
<td>inputs are required for the interventions (Inputs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: A development intervention is used in the generic sense to mean a policy, plan, program or project at either the central/national, sectoral and area levels.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PDP-Chapter Results Matrix (RM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Societal Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outputs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector RM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal/Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outputs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency OPIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal/Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Final Outputs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs, Activities, Projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project LogFrame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal/Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program/Project Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Outputs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NS – Narrative Summary  
OVI s - Objectively Verifiable Indicators  
MOVs - Means of Verification  
A/R - Assumptions/Risks  
LOGFRAMEs at different levels, linked in a “cascading” pattern
DEPARTMENT’S LOGFRAME

CASCADING LOGFRAMES OF OFFICES
BUREAUS/UNITS/PROGRAMS/PROJECTS
WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT

Specific programs, projects and activities of the agencies/offices to produce their intermediate outputs and subsequently, contributing to the relevant MFOs of the Department.
**Impact** - the positive and negative primary and secondary long-term effects – both intended and unintended – produced directly or indirectly by development interventions.

Indirect benefits in the longer term for the target beneficiaries could be society-wide, sectoral and geographic/area levels. In most cases, impacts cannot be fully and directly attributed to specific development interventions because of the complexity of influencing factors.
Outcome - Direct benefits as a result of target groups (either intermediaries or final target groups) using the outputs (in terms of the observable behavioral and institutional changes). Usually these benefits happen/occur in the efforts of the development interventions of the program/project/Department.

Included in the outcome definition is the utilization or adoption of the target groups of the goods or services resulting from programs/projects and activities and inputs/finances.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Goods or services which are produced by programs/projects and activities and inputs/finances.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Programs/projects/ activities required to produce the goods and services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation
What is Evaluation?

“An evaluation is an assessment, as systematic and objective as possible, of an on-going or completed project, program or policy, its design, implementation and results.

The aim is to determine the relevance and fulfillment of objectives, developmental efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability.

An evaluation should provide information that is credible and useful, enabling the incorporation of lessons learned into the decision-making process of both recipients and donors.”

OECD Development Assistance Committee: (www.oecd.org/dac)
Purpose of Evaluation

- Evaluation feeds into management and decision making processes, and makes an essential contribution to managing for results.
- Evaluation informs the planning, programming, budgeting, implementation and reporting cycle.
- Evaluation has the potential to inform decision making at the policy level.
- It aims at improving the institutional relevance, achievement of results, optimizing the use of resources, providing client satisfaction and maximizing the impact of the contribution of the UN system.”

Source: UNEG Norms for Evaluation
Evaluation is answering

• Whether we are **Doing the Right Things**
  - Rationale/justification
  - Client satisfaction

• Whether we are **Doing it Right**
  - Effectiveness/coherence
  - Efficiency: optimizing resources

• Whether there are **Better Ways of Doing it**
  - Alternatives
  - Good practices
  - Lessons learned
Principal Uses of Evaluation

• Learning
  - supporting project/program improvements
  - knowledge generation

• Accountability
  - disclosing information to stakeholders
  - to inform resource allocation
Evaluation Types

- by **timing** – ex-ante, mid-term, terminal, and, ex-post evaluation;

- by **type of evaluator** – internal, external, independent, self-evaluation, joint evaluation, and, participatory evaluation;

- by **object** – cluster, program, project, country program/assistance, sector program, and, thematic evaluation; and,

- by **function** – formative, process, summative, and, meta evaluation.
### Evaluation Criteria

**OECD-DAC five evaluation criteria:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance</strong></td>
<td>The extent to which the aid activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td>A measure of the extent to which an aid activity attains its objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency</strong></td>
<td>Efficiency measures the outputs -- qualitative and quantitative -- in relation to the inputs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact</strong></td>
<td>The positive and negative changes produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability</strong></td>
<td>Sustainability is concerned with measuring whether the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## The DAC Criteria and Project Timing

DAC five evaluation criteria and their use at different evaluation stages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAC Criteria</th>
<th>Ex-Ante Evaluation</th>
<th>Mid-Term Evaluation</th>
<th>Ex-Post Evaluation</th>
<th>Ex-Post Monitoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The DAC Criteria and the Design Monitoring Framework

The DAC Criteria is linked closely with the logframe as illustrated in the shaded sections of the table below.

Source: "Monitoring and Evaluation Based on the PCM Method" issued by FASID

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>Sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outputs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inputs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Evaluation Criteria**

*OECD-DAC five evaluation criteria:* Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact, and Sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DPs</th>
<th>Modifications to the Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JICA</td>
<td><strong>REES</strong> (Rating for the criterion “Impact” is considered as part of “Effectiveness” Rating).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEG</td>
<td><strong>REEIS</strong> plus Coherence, Coverage. “Sustainability” criterion expanded to include Connectedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADB</td>
<td><strong>REES</strong>, which are then aggregated to produce the overall rating. Other assessments include: (a) the impact of the project (a forward-looking assessment) and the performance of ADB and the borrower.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Merges effectiveness and impact into a new concept, efficacy. Adds three new criteria: institutional development impact, bank performance, and borrower performance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Challenges
Key M&E Issues and Challenges

• **Culture of evaluation and accountability**
  
  – Lack of information sharing
  – Systems and mechanisms to support M&E
  – Issues of commitment
  – Issues of capacity
  – Reporting for compliance rather ‘reflection for learning’
Key M&E Issues and Challenges

- M & E Roles of institutions???
- Coordination around M&E - between and among oversight and implementing Departments/Agencies/Entities
Key M&E Issues and Challenges

- Quality of Results framework
  - Lack of clarity and specificity in the results chain
  - Issues of ambition and scope of results
  - Definitional issues (Pro-poor; Functional systems; Quality reports)
Key M&E Issues and Challenges

- Quality of M&E framework
  - Vague indicators
  - Poor or non-existent baselines
  - Mismatch between indicator, baseline and target
  - No disaggregated indicators and baselines to capture socio, economic, cultural and gender disparities
  - Dearth of quality data
Key M&E Issues and Challenges

Institutionalization of results management

- Input/Output vs. Outcome/Impact
- Project evaluation vs. Outcome evaluations
- Input/activity monitoring vs. output monitoring for contributing to higher results
Key M&E Issues and Challenges

Use of M&E data

- Poor quality of data and analysis
- Limited engagement of stakeholders in M&E processes
- Ownership issues, especially in evaluation
- Non-clarity on the users of M&E information
- Poor dissemination strategies and follow up mechanisms
Take-Aways

• So many concepts but all are centered on results.

• M&E are distinct but complementary functions.

• Institutions are in place to address M&E concerns.

• There are many challenges but we are doing something.
Public Sector Management Cycle

Note: Framework based on the results-based Public Sector Management (PSM) framework developed by the Asia-Pacific Community of Practice on Managing for Development Results (APCoP-MfDR).
Results-Based Management

An approach to managing projects and programs that involves:

• Specifying desired long and medium term results for a project, and the outputs the project will deliver to achieve them
• Choosing indicators to measure project performance
• Undertaking activities and producing outputs
• Collecting performance information
• Using performance information to manage, learn, and change
Managing for Development Results (MfDR)

MfDR is a management strategy focused on development performance and on sustainable improvements in country outcomes. It provides a coherent framework for development effectiveness in which performance information is used for improved decision making, and it includes practical tools for strategic planning, risk management, progress monitoring, and outcome evaluation.¹
Managing for Development Results

“MfDR is a management approach with a focus on performance management. Other terms that also describe this management approach include: (a) results-based management; (b) results management; and, (c) performance management and measurement.”

-ADB, MfDR in Support of Poverty Reduction in South Asia

“Although RBM is nearly synonymous with MfDR as we currently understand it, some approaches to RBM have focused only on accountability. MfDR goes further, incorporating newer ideas about partnership, country ownership, harmonization, and alignment. MfDR provides a higher management standard because it asks all stakeholders to focus continuously on country outcome performance, rather than on short-term results.”

-World Bank, Sourcebook on Emerging Good Practice in MfDR