

M&E in the context of new aid modalities

Focus on Performance Assessment Frameworks (PAFs) and Joint (sector) Reviews

Nathalie Holvoet
Institute of Development Policy and Management
BOS-PRSP

DGOS Seminarie Begrotingshulp 1/03/2007



Universiteit
Antwerpen

Outline

1. Paris Declaration M&E Reform Agenda
2. Rationale of M&E Harmonisation and Alignment
3. PAFs and Joint (sector) Reviews: filling the M&E gap
 - 3.1. Performance Assessment Frameworks
 - 3.2. Joint (sector) Reviews
4. Strengthening recipient M&E system

1. Paris Declaration M&E Reform Agenda

Donors

Reduce the M&E-burden through:

- **Harmonisation**
→ coordination, rationalisation, exchange of information
- **Alignment**
→ Rely upon and use recipient M&E

Recipients

Establish results-oriented M&E system

2. Rationale of M&E Harmonisation and Alignment

- Isolated donor M&E flawed
 - Huge transaction costs
 - Learning deficit (see also Rekenhof on BOF-evaluations)
 - .lack of impact evaluation (public goods problem)
 - .mutual learning curtailed (at level of substance and methodology)
 - in context of new aid modalities: useless and counterproductive
 - .attribution problem
 - .undermining of recipient M&E strengthening
- M&E Harmonisation and Alignment \neq absence of M&E

3. PAFs & Joint (Sector) Reviews: filling the M&E gap

5

- Paris-Declaration-inspired M&E exercises for existing M&E needs
 - **Accountability**
 - .beyond input and monitoring
 - .process conditionality
 - .early warning system (iterative approach within LT-partnership)
 - Influence on identification and usage of triggers for tranche release
 - **Learning and feedback**
 - .policy dialogue → ↑ probability of feedback and learning (see also Rekenhof on BOF evaluations)
 - **Capacity building of the recipient institutional apparatus (see also 4)**
 - .recipient M&E supply and demand side

3.1. Performance Assessment Frameworks

- set of **key** inputs, actions, output and outcome indicators
 - Danger of overloading PAFs (unrealistic)
- ideally taken from the PRSP (ownership)
- basis for monitoring of 'recipient' performance, review and assessment, dialogue, early warning
 - ↓ automatic sanctioning on the basis of triggers

3.1. Performance Assessment Frameworks (continued)

- multi-donor
 - Harmonisation
 - Risk of undesired aid volatility
 - ↓ through variegated donor response
- could also be extended to check donor's performance ('mutual accountability'): see Mozambique PAP's PAF (<http://www.pap.org.mz>)

3.2. Joint (Sector) Reviews

- “assessment of the performance of an intervention, periodically (yearly) or ad hoc
- an M&E ‘snapshot’ in a continuous (joint) process of follow-up (often through sector working groups)
- Actors involved:
 - ✓ Government (different layers and levels)
 - ✓ Donors (BS)
 - ✓ Sometimes non-BS donors (embed project M&E within sector M&E)
 - ✓ Non-government actors (NGOs, CSOs, universities, audit offices, parliamentarians, etc.)

3.2. Joint (Sector) Review (continued)

- Instrument of accountability, learning and capacity-building
- Based on a variety of information sources (triangulation → ↑ validity of conclusions)
 - Existing secondary data
 - ✓ Government data (MIS)
 - ✓ Existing independent national and international data sources
 - ✓ Information collected through the continuous process of follow-up
 - Primary data collection
 - ✓ Reality checks on the ground
 - ✓ New (commissioned) independent studies (mostly focusing on 'experiments', impact evaluation)
- Feedback and discussion with stakeholders during Annual Review Meeting → increases its influence

4. Strengthening recipient M&E system/arrangements

- Maturing of recipient's M&E supply and demand side: needed for sustainability
 - Results-orientation (MTEF)
 - (Downward) accountability
- So far: relatively neglected
 - Absence of joint diagnosis (\leftrightarrow PFM diagnosis bombardment)
 - Too little coordinated capacity-building of supply and demand side
 - Not enough M&E of progress in recipient M&E system (\leftrightarrow process conditionality)