

July 2008

Capacity Development for Monitoring and Evaluation

TA Number:	6410-REG
TA Amount:	\$500,000
Source of Finance:	Regional Cooperation and Poverty Reduction Fund, provided by the Government of the People's Republic of China
Approval Date:	3 September 2007
Project Duration:	2 years
Commencement and Completion Dates:	October 2007–2009
Project Manager:	Olivier Serrat
Department:	Operations Evaluation Department
Regional Cooperation Initiative Pillar:	Development of regional public goods in monitoring and evaluation

Project Overview

The Asian Development Bank (ADB) places a premium on results and is committed to strengthening the capacity of its [developing member countries](#) (DMCs) to manage for that. Strong monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems contribute to poverty reduction. They also improve the quality of ADB's own M&E, both in the form of self-evaluation by operational departments of development interventions, and independent evaluation of these by the [Operations Evaluation Department](#) (OED).

For these reasons, OED has backed [evaluation capacity development](#) (ECD) since 1990 to raise awareness of the critical role that M&E can play in promoting the transparency, accountability, results orientation, and effectiveness of management systems. Principally at the national and sectoral levels, its interventions so far have (i) stimulated thinking on the function of M&E in good governance and public sector reform; (ii) explored the complementarities between M&E, results-based management, and internal auditing; (iii) identified strategies and resources for building demand for and supply of M&E; and (iv) encouraged and supported the creation of country and regional networks to facilitate follow-up actions.

However, the changing development context in Asia and the Pacific and the advent of learning organizations and knowledge-based economies have fed stocktaking exercises in OED, which has placed a stronger accent on ECD. This decision is also congruent with items on the international development agenda, such as the [Millennium Development Goals](#) and ADB's support for these. From experience with national and sectoral M&E systems, it is meaningful to strengthen ECD at the regional level in the framework of ADB's various regional initiatives.

The impact of the [technical assistance](#) (TA) is expected to be higher efficiency and effectiveness in public sector service provision, leading to poverty reduction. In the evaluation agencies targeted, the outcome is intended to be improved ranges of skills, resources, systems, and attitudes for performance of results-based M&E of country partnership strategies, sector strategies, policies, programs, and projects in the participating DMCs, viz., [Cambodia](#), [Lao People's Democratic Republic](#) (Lao PDR), and [Viet Nam](#). Three outputs will

accomplish the outcome of the TA: (i) proficiency in M&E will be raised, (ii) research and special studies on ECD will be conducted, and (iii) knowledge sharing and learning for M&E will be boosted.

Progress to Date

The actual work plan and completed activities for period April–July 2008 are as shown below:

A. Project Actions and Activities Completed for Report Period

Month	Dates	Activities
March	31 March–1 April 2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TA program participants attend the MES Evaluation Conference as part of their learning program • Participants go through 2 weeks of training, including participation at the Malaysian Evaluation Society (MES) Evaluation Conference from 31 March–1 April 2008. • Participants also joined the 1-day post-conference workshops from 2–3 April 2008. These workshops covered a range of topics related to M&E. • A copy of the conference program showing the keynote addresses and paper topics is in Appendix 1; • The conference also shows active participation from the OED with a keynote address by Mr. Keith Leonard and a paper presentation by Mr. Olivier Serrat.
April	2–3 April 2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TA program participants attend the MES post-conference workshops on various aspects of monitoring and evaluation and related topics. • A copy of the workshop program and topics presented are given in Appendix 2. • The TA participants attended all workshops except the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 10+2 Steps to Designing and Building a Results-Based Monitoring and Evaluation System, and - Designing and working with strategic Key Performance Indicators. • The above two workshops were excluded as the topics under them were being covered in week 2 of the TA's M&E workshop. • Workshop feedback was very positive and the participants felt that they learned a lot from both the conference and post-conference workshops. • Participation at the MES conference and post-conference workshops was followed by an intensive 1-week training workshop covering the essentials of M&E in the public sector. • This 1-week workshop was conducted by four experts with support from two M&E experts from Southern Africa. • The week 2 workshop program covered topics that ranged from basic concepts to application of such concepts. Since this was a basic course, the workshop was kept to basic core topics under M&E. • Apart from the course work, the workshop also required the country participants to discuss and produce a case study country paper pertaining to the M&E situation in their respective countries. • Appendix 3 shows the various topics covered in this Module. • The workshop evaluation showed a high level of appreciation of the workshop and topics. However, there were also suggestions to include some agency visits to obtain first-hand exposure to actual M&E in practice. This suggestion will be taken into account for future workshops. • The workshop is only the first in the series with a total of four workshops to be conducted on a progressively advanced level. The final workshop

Month	Dates	Activities
May		<p>will be held at the Shanghai International Program for Development Evaluation Training (SHIPDET) premises in Shanghai in October 2009.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The workshop in Kuala Lumpur in April 2008 was conducted as a prelude to the second workshop planned for October 2008 to be held in Viet Nam. • Participants were provided with a set of guidelines to help them prepare a detailed country case study between the months of May and August 2008. • The country case study, besides being a country assessment, also serves to provide useful information on the background and status of M&E in the respective countries. This is among the expected deliverables for the project which is carrying out research and special studies on ECD in the Greater Mekong Subregion (GMS) DMCs. • The case study was guided by a set of topics and questions which covered all relevant aspects related to M&E in the countries concerned. A copy of the guidelines is given in Appendix 4. • The first draft of the case study reports have been received by the Center for Development and Research in Evaluation (CeDRE), Malaysia and are now being analyzed. • The findings of the country survey and case study will be used to inform the formulation of country strategies for evaluation capacity development for these countries. • As part of the deliverables for the capacity building component of the project, preliminary work commenced for the training and capacity building of policy level senior officials from the three GMS DMCs. A total of three officials were tentatively short-listed from the three countries. Efforts were also made to negotiate with the International Program for Development Evaluation Training (IPDET) at Carleton University, Canada for the above training program. • However, after a detailed review of the IPDET program, it was found to be unsuitable/inadequate to meet the requirements of the policy level M&E capacity-building that was the intention of the TA program. • CeDRE, Malaysia, after consultation with the Project Manager at ADB, is actively seeking another university in Australia to carry out a tailor-made program for the policy level senior officials from the three countries. To make the program more efficient, CeDRE, Malaysia has proposed that all six senior policy level officials be allowed to attend the tailor-made program. The dates will be fixed after negotiations with the Australian university are concluded. The actual training session for these officials may be conducted in early 2009 instead of 2008 as originally planned. • Another deliverable under the project is the formation of M&E networks for the GMS DMCs. While waiting for a more formal mechanism to be designed and set up for networking members, CeDRE, Malaysia set up a list serve to help improve communication and networking among the workshop participants. This network is called the ADB TA 6410 Discussion Forum and is currently hosted by CeDRE International as a support service to the TA project. This network will continue until such time the official website and network facilities are set up with the assistance of the ADB.

Month	Dates	Activities
June		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The country case study mentioned above was continued during the month of June with the workshop participants carrying out the survey and assessment work in-country with the assistance and supervision of the national consultants (there are three national M&E consultants for the three GMS DMC countries). • Work was also initiated on the preparations for the phase 2 of the M&E capacity building program under the project. CeDRE, Malaysia held discussions with the team members via the online forum as well as direct communication with the national consultants using online web chats and video conferencing. • Work is in progress with the identification and negotiations to run a tailor-made M&E program for senior policy level officials from the GMS DMCs. The negotiations are likely to be finalized in a month or so and the tailor-made program will be designed and finalized. • Preliminary discussions were also held with the national M&E consultants on the upcoming October in-country workshops for the Training of Trainers (ToT) program. This will be the second workshop in the series of four workshops; with the first workshop already completed in April 2008 in Kuala Lumpur.
July		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical guidance was given for country teams on analyzing the country survey and preparing the country case study and M&E survey report. • The first draft was received by CeDRE, Malaysia in late July and is currently being reviewed. • Preliminary planning is being done for stage 2 of the M&E ToT workshop planned for 20–24 October 2008 and to be held in Viet Nam. • Preliminary negotiations to design and develop a customized M&E workshop in Australia for policy level officials from Cambodia, Lao PDR, and Viet Nam are also ongoing.

B. Planned Activities for the Coming Period: August–October 2008

Month	Dates	Activities
August		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of the country case studies and survey results • Preparation of preliminary findings and identification of remedial actions required for each case study • Discussions on the participation of officials from other GMS DMC countries, People's Republic of China (PRC), and Central Asia Regional Economic Cooperation (CAREC) countries to join the October ToT workshop in Viet Nam • Ongoing work on developing and designing the customized M&E course for senior policy level officials from the GMS DMCs
September	8–13 September 2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of the country case studies and survey results • Review sessions with country teams on the survey and case study report • On-site meeting with national consultants and country teams in respective home country to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - review the case study report and carry out interviews with key officials where necessary; - review progress with application of M&E tools and techniques

Month	Dates	Activities
October	20-24 Oct.	<p>learnt at the Stage 1 workshop in Kuala Lumpur;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - preliminary planning and discussions with workshop participants and national consultants on the design, content, and delivery of the stage 2 M&E ToT workshop scheduled for October 2008; and - work with the national consultant from Viet Nam on the program and logistic arrangements of the October ToT workshop to be held in Viet Nam from 20–24 October 2008 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussions and finalization of the participation of officials from other GMS DMC countries, PRC, and CAREC countries to join the October ToT workshop in Viet Nam • Ongoing work on developing and designing the customized M&E course for senior policy level officials from the GMS DMCs • Finalization of the workshop program, materials, and other logistics arrangements for the ToT workshop from 20–24 October 2008 in Viet Nam • The workshop will be held in Ha Long Bay away from Hanoi to ensure that the Vietnamese participants can focus on the workshop and also to enable night sessions for the ToT workshop. • Finalization of the arrangements for the M&E course for senior level M&E officials from GMS DMCs; • Finalize the M&E case study and report and prepare indicative strategy paper in consultation with GMS country representatives and ADB.

General Comments

The planned activities for the period have been successfully carried out. These include the following:

- (i) Stage one M&E workshop for a group of 17 participants from the three GMS DMCs of Cambodia, Lao PDR, and Viet Nam was successfully completed in Kuala Lumpur from 31 March–11 April 2008.
- (ii) The participants included two national M&E consultants from Viet Nam and Lao PDR. The appointment of the national consultant from Cambodia was delayed due to difficulties with identifying a suitable candidate from Cambodia. This problem has since been solved with the appointment of a national consultant with effect from June 2008.
- (iii) An initial country case study was completed during the Kuala Lumpur workshop as a workshop case study.
- (iv) A more detailed country survey and case study was designed by CeDRE, Malaysia and the survey work conducted in the three countries between the months of May–July 2008.
- (v) The teams have submitted their initial draft case study report to CeDRE, Malaysia. The report is being reviewed and some additional work will be carried out in the month of August 2008. The findings of the case study will be used to inform:
 - the second M&E workshop in Viet Nam from 20–24 October 2008;
 - the identification and development of an ECD strategy for the GMS DMCs; and
 - the identification and development of strategies for the ECD initiative by ADB.
- (vi) The training program for the participants from the GMS DMCs was also offered to Thailand and PRC but despite reminders, there were no nominations or candidates from these countries. This could be due to the fact that these countries would have had to pay for attending the M&E training program being conducted under this TA.
- (vii) For the upcoming stage 2 M&E workshop to be held in Viet Nam from 20–24 October 2008, there is a possibility that some officials from Central Asia may join the workshop. CeDRE,

Malaysia will be writing to Thailand and PRC again to see if they wish to join the stage 2 workshop in Viet Nam.

Actions Taken in Response to the Recommendations of the Previous Monthly Progress Note

There were no specific recommendations arising out of the earlier progress report. However, the planned actions and deliverables for the project have been pursued and completed as per plan with the exception of the M&E training for the senior policy officials from the GMS DMCs. As mentioned earlier, a special tailor-made course is being identified and is expected to be held in early 2009 for all six policy level M&E officials from the three GMS DMCs.

Malaysian Evaluation Society (MES)

Evaluation Under a “Managing for Development Results” Environment

CONFERENCE PROGRAM

Day 1: 31 March 2008

0730 – 0830	Registration
0845 – 0850	Welcome Address President, Malaysian Evaluation Society
0855 – 0905	Opening Address: Oumoul Ba Tall, President, IOCE
0910 – 0930	Official Conference Opening & Keynote Address <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Managing for Development Results & Evaluation: An Integrated Approach for Improving Public Sector Performance” Hon. Dep. Minister of Finance, Malaysia
0930 – 1000	Refreshments
1000-1030	Keynote Address 1: “Resource Use and Program Performance in Government through Results-Based Budgeting” Deputy Secretary General, Ministry of Finance, Malaysia
1030-1100	Keynote Address 2: Improving Project, Program, Policy and Performance in Developing Countries Through Managing for Development Results Keith Leonard, Director, OED, ADB
1105 – 1245	Evaluation Methodologies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Linking Strategic KPIs with Evaluation Design (Jerry Winston PPSEI, Australia & Dr. Arunaselam Rasappan, CeDRE International) • Institutionalizing Monitoring and Evaluation through a Standardized Logic Model Approach to Defining Development Management Performance Results (Sandiran Premakanthan, Management Consultant, Canada) • Evaluation Methodologies for Identifying Key Performance Indicators of Public Universities in Malaysia (Dr. Chan Yuen Fook, University Technology MARA)
1245 – 1400	Lunch
1400 – 1440	Resources Utilization for Development Results: Applying a Performance Management System in a Development Context (Dr. Yeow Poon, People & Organisation, UK)
1445 – 1525	Integrating Evaluation Into the Budgetary Process for Improved Program Performance (K. Kumaran & Koshy Thomas, Ministry of Finance, Malaysia)
1530 – 1610	Budgeting and Resources Management as Tools for Focusing Public Sector Programs (Winston Tan, Civil Service College, Singapore)
1615 – 1655	Planning for Gathering Performance Results Evidence for Improved Measurement, Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting of Development Results (Sandiran Premakanthan, Management Consultant, Canada)
1700 - 1730	Refreshments

Day 2: 1 April 2008

0830 – 0910	Keynote Address 3 Evaluation: A Strategic Tool for Improving National Development Plans Tan Sri Khalid Ramli, DG, Prime Minister’s Department, Malaysia
0915 – 0945	Keynote Address 4 Public Sector Performance Management Through MfDR Application: Global Trends and Experiences Susan Stout, Senior Manager, Results Management Unit, World Bank
0945- 1015	Refreshments
1020 – 1140	Sustainable Evaluation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How to Instigate and Support an Outcome-Oriented Approach and Culture in Government (Dr. Craig Russon, ILO-IPEC) • Ensuring Upward and Downward Accountability in Development (Pindai Sithole, Zimbabwe Evaluation Society/ /Beth Allardice, New Zealand) • Strengthening Public Sector Integrity Through Institutionalizing Evaluation (Datuk Dr. Mohd Tap Salleh, Integrity Institute Malaysia)
1145 – 1300	Information Technology Tools for Evaluation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PPMS: A Cost-Effective E-Solution to Systematic Performance Planning and Measurement in the Public Sector (Dr. Arunaselam Rasappan, CeDRE International) • Management of Project Knowledge – A Solutions Perspective (Sha-Lyn Loh, InSynchro, Malaysia) • M&E Solutions for Public Sector Management (Nimit Leelasorn, Galexo Consulting, Australia)
1300 – 1400	Lunch
1400 – 1600	Knowledge Utilization: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning Lessons with Knowledge Audits (Olivier Serrat, ADB) • Knowledge Management and Managing Knowledge: Building a Culture in which Knowledge is Developed and Used (Bob Williams/ Kate McKegg, New Zealand) • Internalised Self-Evaluation for Improving Knowledge Utilization and Program Improvement (Koshy Thomas, MoF Malaysia) • Improving Public Services Delivery and Development Management in Local Government Using the Performance Report Card (Mahalingam. M., CeDRE International / Dr. Suresh Balakrishnan, PAC, India)
1605 – 1640	Closing Panel Discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ministry of Finance, Malaysia • Keith Leonard, Asian Development Bank • Susan Stout, World Bank • Dr. Arunaselam Rasappan, CeDRE International
1645 – 1700	Official Closing Secretary General, MoF, Malaysia
1700 – 1730	Refreshments

Malaysian Evaluation Society (MES)
3rd International Evaluation Conference: Kuala Lumpur 31 Mar–4 Apr 2008
Evaluation under a “Managing for Development Results (MfDR)” Environment

Post Conference Workshops: 2–3 April 2008

DAY 1: WEDNESDAY, 2 APRIL 2008

REF.	SESSION TITLE	PRESENTER/S
WS 01	Planning for Gathering Performance Results Evidence for Improved Measurement, Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting of Development Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sandiran Premakanthan, Management Consultant, Canada
WS 02	Knowledge Utilization for Improving Program and Policy Decisions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bob Williams, Independent Consultant, New Zealand • Kate McKegg, New Zealand
WS 03	Achieving Performance Through Budgets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Winston Tan, Civil Service College, Singapore
WS 04	Monitoring and Evaluation: Understanding the Differences and How to Use These Two Approaches in a Complementary Fashion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr. Craig Russon, International Labor Organization - IPEC
WS 05	Designing and Working with Strategic Key Performance Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jerry Winston, PPSEI, Australia • Dr. Arunaselam Rasappan, (CeDRE Malaysia)

DAY 2: THURSDAY, 3 APRIL 2008

WS 06	10+2 Steps to Designing and Building a Results-Based Monitoring and Evaluation System	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr. Arunaselam Rasappan, CeDRE International
WS 07	Improving Decision-Making Through Data Management in Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr. Chan Yuen Fook (UiTM) • Chong Chiew Kieok (Independent Consultant)
WS 08	Fun & Games with Logframes : Participatory Strategies to Teach Logical Frameworks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scott Chaplowe, American Red Cross International Services
WS 09	Working with NVivo Application for Improving Qualitative Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pindai Sithole, Zimbabwe Evaluation Society • Justice Marwisa, Zimbabwe Evaluation Society
WS 10	Designing and Applying a Performance Management System	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr. Yeow Poon, People & Organisation, UK

Monitoring and Evaluation Course Program

WEEK 2: 7–11 April 2008

Day/Date Time	Monday 7 April	Tuesday 8 April	Wednesday 9 April	Thursday 10 April	Friday 11 April
0900 -1030	Introduction to the TA Project & Team Building (Aru Rasappan/Jerry Winston/Maha)	Module 3: Integrated Results-Based Management (IRBM) & Foundations for M&E (Maha/Aru Rasappan)	Module 5: Introduction to Program Logic (Aru Rasappan/Jerry Winston)	Module 6: Linking Monitoring with Evaluation (Jerry Winston)	Module 8: MIS: Utilizing M&E for Policy and Program Decision-Making (Aru Rasappan/Jerry Winston)
1030 - 1100	Refreshment Break	Refreshment Break	Refreshment Break	Refreshment Break	Refreshment Break
1100 - 1230	Module 2: Understanding the M&E Language and Jargon (Jerry Winston/Aru Rasappan)	Module 4: Integrated Development Planning & Macro Development Framework (Koshy Thomas /Maha)	Program Logic in M&E (Aru Rasappan/Jerry Winston)	Module 7: M&E Planning Framework & Design Work (Aru Rasappan)	Module 9: Capacity Building for M&E & MfDR (Jerry Winston/Aru Rasappan) Module 10: Organising the Country Team and Project Action Plan (Aru Rasappan/Maha/Jerry Winston)
1230 - 1330	LUNCH BREAK	LUNCH BREAK	LUNCH BREAK	LUNCH BREAK	LUNCH BREAK
1330 - 1500	Group Work: Country Case Study on M&E (Aru Rasappan/Jerry Winston/Maha)	Group Work: IRBM & Macro Development Results Framework Koshy Thomas /Maha	Group Work: Program Logic in M&E (Aru Rasappan/Jerry Winston)	Group Work: M&E Planning Framework & Design Work (Aru Rasappan/Jerry Winston)	Presentation of Country Case Study & M&E Plan (Aru Rasappan/Maha/Jerry Winston)
1500 – 1520	Refreshment Break	Refreshment Break	Refreshment Break	Refreshment Break	Refreshment Break
1520 - 1630	Presentations & Discussion on Country Case Study (Aru Rasappan/Jerry Winston/Maha)	Presentation & Discussion on Macro Development Results Framework Koshy Thomas /Maha	Presentation and Discussion on Program Theory & Program Logic (Aru Rasappan/Jerry Winston)	Presentation & Discussion on M&E Planning Framework (Aru Rasappan/Jerry Winston)	Presentation: Country Project Action Plan (Aru Rasappan/Maha/Jerry Winston)
1630-1700	Introduction to PPMS for M&E Planning, Design & Implementation (Aru Rasappan/Maha)	PPMS for M&E Planning, Design & Implementation (Aru Rasappan /Maha)	PPMS for M&E Planning, Design & Implementation (Aru Rasappan /Maha)	PPMS for M&E Design & Implementation (Aru Rasappan /Maha)	Final Review Session, Synthesis, & Closing (Aru Rasappan/Maha/Jerry Winston)
1700	Break	Break	Break	Break	Close

Resource Persons: 1. Dr. Aru Rasappan (CeDRE, Malaysia); 2. Jerome Winston (PPSEI, Australia); 3. Mahalingam M. (CeDRE, Malaysia); 4. Koshy Thomas (Ministry of Finance, Malaysia). **Additional Support Resource Persons:** 1. Pindai Sithole (Zimbabwe Evaluation Society); 2. Ms. Goaba Mosienyane (Independent M&E Consultant, Botswana).

Workshop Secretariat Support: CeDRE, Malaysia.

M&E Capacity-Building Course: Kuala Lumpur: 31 March–11 April 2008

Country Case Study on M&E: Checklist & Guidelines

The following [checklist](#) has been prepared as a guide to assist the Asian Development Bank's technical assistance no. 6410-REG: Capacity Development for Monitoring and Evaluation monitoring and evaluation (M&E) course participants in the M&E project case study. The checklist, though not exhaustive, will assist in the identification of some key component areas of M&E (such as the planning framework, policies and strategies for M&E, institutions and structure including institutional arrangements, roles and responsibilities of key institutions/stakeholders responsible for M&E, information systems and capacity building) that may need to be addressed as well as issues that may be specific to your country situation.

The checklist will also help us map out the dynamics of the current M&E system in your country and assist in identifying suitable actions (in your country context) to be taken to further strengthen M&E in your country. As you prepare the case study, you also may wish to consider and research other related M&E areas arising from your discussions and consultations with key stakeholders which are important in your country context.

Listed below are the key issue areas that we would like you to focus on for your country assessment assignment and some specific requirements.

- a. Kindly carry out the assessment between now and end of July 2008.
- b. You may conduct the assessment below as a team or by dividing your group into smaller groups with each group focusing on specific issue areas.
- c. Country assessments and your report should contain copies of all relevant documents such as decrees, regulations, circulars, directives, etc.
- d. All documentation for the country assessments must be in the English language.
- e. Where materials are not available in the English language, the group would need to ensure that all such materials are translated into English.
- f. All country assessments should be completed and integrity checked by the whole group **before the end of July 2008**.
- g. The country case study above should then be submitted to Center for Development and Research in Evaluation (CeDRE) International no later than the **end of July 2008**.
- h. CeDRE International and CeDRE, Malaysia will review all country case studies submitted and will take them into account when designing the focus and contents of the 2nd M&E Course to be held in Hanoi in **October 2008**.
- i. CeDRE, Malaysia will communicate with the team members should there be any additional work required for the country assessment.

The following are the topics and questions required for the country assessment:

1.0 Planning framework

- 1.1 What type of development planning framework is in place in your country and whether it has been institutionalized throughout the government?
- 1.2 Describe the details of the planning system to develop national policies and priorities that will be translated into development programs and sectoral strategies.
- 1.3 What is the type of development planning framework that is currently in place and its linkages to the budgetary process (i.e., the MTEF, SEDP, NDP, etc.)? To what extent is monitoring and evaluation of the national development plan integrated into the national planning process and the development plan?
- 1.4 How does the national development plan incorporate vertical and horizontal linkages (HoVer Principle)?
- 1.5 What is the process for cascading the national development plan to the sectors and sub-sectors and then down to the implementation levels?
- 1.6 What is the process for linking resources usage (budget expenditure) to the achievement of national priorities (Key Result Areas)?
- 1.7 What is the basis for decision-making in national development plan formulation and adjustments (i.e., what kinds of information are used and issues related to the validity and reliability of such information for decision-making)?

2.0 Policies and Strategies for M&E

- 2.1 Describe whether the current M&E system in your country is:
 - a. A whole-of-government system, covering all central ministries, departments, agencies, and provinces/states;
 - b. More narrowly focused on individual sectors and sub-sectors;¹
 - c. Is based on individual ministries and departments; or
 - d. Mainly confined to donor-funded projects in the country.
- 2.2 What policies and strategies are there for establishing and institutionalizing M&E in the country?
- 2.3 What are the policies currently in place with regard to M&E in your country? (describe all types/forms of policies in place (laws/statutes, decrees, decisions, regulations, administrative rules etc)
- 2.4 What are the existing strategies being used in your country to develop and implement M&E for the relevant levels?²
- 2.5 Analyze the effectiveness of various M&E policies and practices, in light of the country's political, institutional, administrative setups, and economic context.
- 2.6 What kind of political commitment and support is there at the highest policy and management levels for establishing/utilizing M&E across government?
- 2.7 What are the existing M&E policies and strategies at the organizational level both at the Central level and lower levels (provincial/district, etc.)?
- 2.8 To what extent are policy formulation and resource allocation decisions based on evidence generated through an M&E system?

3.0 Institutional & Structural Arrangements for M&E³

- 3.1 What are the existing institutional & structural arrangements⁴ for M&E at:
 - a. Central Policy Ministries (such as MPI and MoF)?
 - b. Line Ministries (operational Ministries and all other implementing entities)?
 - c. Regional or sub national level (provincial/state and district authorities)?
 Identify the following aspects for **all 3 levels** above:⁵
- 3.2 What are the existing institutional structures that are in place to oversee M&E policies and implementation?
- 3.3 Identify the policy ministries or agencies responsible for issuing and monitoring policies on M&E system.
- 3.4 What are the roles of key central policy ministries with regard to M&E implementation in line ministries and lower levels?
- 3.5 How actively are central policy ministries involved in monitoring/supervising or guiding line ministries in terms of resources allocation and utilization?
- 3.6 Which agencies have the responsibility for coordinating the formulation of socioeconomic development plans, policies and programs, including public sector investment programs?
- 3.7 At the sectoral level, confirm whether each Ministry has responsibility for monitoring the activities in its area and describe how they are undertaking these functions.
- 3.8 Identify the relationship and the extent to which evaluation is used to decide resource allocations and program decisions.

¹ Sectors refer to economic, social, administration, and security sectors. Sub-sectors are identified under each sector—for example, agriculture is a sub-sector and comes under the economic sector.

² Levels here refer to central, provincial, and district levels. Below district, we may have village, commune, etc.

³ Institutional and structural here means the organizations and/or entities that are responsible for M&E and how they interact with one another.

⁴ Identify which institutions (example ministries, departments, and/or other entities) at each level are responsible for M&E and describe how they interact or work with each other within each level and at other levels.

⁵ Vertical integration issues.

- 3.9 What are the institutional arrangements for performance reporting under the national development plans and the process of performance reporting?
- 3.10 What mechanisms are in place for adequate inter-agency coordination⁶ of development results?

4.0 Key Stakeholders in M&E – Roles and responsibilities

- 4.1 Are there any M&E advocates or champions within the government?
- 4.2 Who are the principal stakeholders in your country who can make a change in the M&E policies and system?
- 4.3 Which ministries and agencies have major responsibility for monitoring and evaluation policy issues?
- 4.4 Which ministries have special M&E and performance audit units? How many staff are employed in each of these special entities?
- 4.5 What kind of evaluation activities do central policy and line ministries undertake and how often?
- 4.6 Have these evaluations been structured and institutionalized? If so, please obtain full details of the institutional and process arrangements.
- 4.7 Describe the linkages and the extent of influence evaluation has on resource allocation and decision-making by both internal management as well as policy ministries.
- 4.8 Are there clear links between personnel performance and project/program performance? If yes, please provide details.
- 4.9 What is the role and participation of the private sector, civil society and NGOs in participatory M&E (i.e., presenting clients/citizen views on government service delivery, providing analysis and opinions of government performance, citizen report-cards and media reporting, etc.)?

5.0 Information System

- 5.1 Are there proper or adequate information systems to collect data for the decision-making process at various levels?
- 5.2 What formal processes and requirements are there for the monitoring and reporting of budget allocations, actual expenditures, outputs, and outcomes?
- 5.3 What types of data collection systems and processes are in place internally within ministries and departments for systematic performance monitoring and performance data collection?
- 5.4 How is program and project performance data from the provinces/states collected and integrated at the central level?
- 5.5 Are the existing information systems providing timely, accurate, and reliable information to enable policy and program improvement decision making?
- 5.6 How is M&E information being used to help improve government performance?
- 5.7 Are there adequate sharing of information among the various agencies and especially agencies that are contributing to the same priority areas?
- 5.8 Which agencies are actually using information from the M&E system to improve program improvement or performance?
- 5.9 Are there any computerized systems or e-enabled systems for performance monitoring and systematic collection of information?

6.0 Capacity building needs

- 6.1 Has there been any Training Needs Assessment conducted for M&E capacity building in your country?
- 6.2 What are the areas of training needs identified/required for M&E?
- 6.3 Provide details of training that have been conducted for proficiency in monitoring and evaluation among government agencies.
- 6.4 Provide a list of training courses in areas related to M&E, such as, but not restricted to log frame, performance monitoring indicators, results-based management, program evaluation, cost-benefit

⁶ Horizontal integration issues.

analysis, qualitative and quantitative research, data collection and management, and questionnaire design. For what levels were such training provided for (beginners, intermediate, advanced)?

- 6.5 Identify the organizations or training institutes which currently provide training in M&E and in related areas as above.
- 6.6 Identify the different types of audiences for whom training is provided, especially those in the public sector, and the nature of the training whether it is introductory (awareness training) or more advanced.
- 6.7 What efforts to institutionalize training in evaluation have been conducted (including training of trainers) particularly on methodological aspects of evaluation?
- 6.8 Identify some major constraints significantly affecting capacity building efforts for M&E in your country.