

Assessment of sector monitoring and evaluation systems

Findings from health sector M&E systems in Rwanda and Uganda

Debriefing, January 2012

Nathalie Holvoet & Liesbeth Inberg

Content

1. Objectives and methodology
2. Background/ rationale
3. Assessment tool
4. Findings for Rwanda and Uganda
5. Conclusions
6. Q & A

Annexes

1. Checklist M&E system at sector level
2. Selected references

1. Objectives and methodology

Objectives

- To elaborate an assessment tool to diagnose/ monitor/ evaluate the quality of sector M&E systems.
- To apply this tool to a number of selected number of cases where Belgium is providing sector budget support.

Methodology

- Combination of desk and field study
- Two sectors and four countries
 - Education: Uganda and Vietnam
 - Health: Niger, Rwanda and Uganda
- Output so far:
 - 2 missions: Rwanda and Uganda (health)
 - 3 reports
 - Niger (February 2011)
 - Rwanda (July 2011)
 - Uganda (December 2011, draft)

2. Background/ rationale

2. Background/ rationale (i)

- Importance of M&E
 - evidence-based, iterative approach (**learning**)
 - results-based management (learning – **accountability**)
 - domestic accountability (M&E by non-state actors)
- M&E reform agenda
 - recipients: Establish results-oriented M&E system (see PD indicator 11)
 - donors: harmonisation and alignment

2. Background/ rationale (ii)

- Rationale for 'harmonisation' & 'alignment'
 - isolated donor M&E flawed
 - huge transaction costs
 - learning deficit
 - .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
 - Progress in implementation: **slow and difficult, but recently some progress in indicator 11**

2. Background/ rationale (iii)

	Recipients	Donors
2006 PD survey	2 (44) adequate results-oriented frameworks (5%)	18% joint missions 42% joint analytical work 28% of donor portfolio uses country M&E systems (2004) PFM: 40%; procurement: 39% (2005)
2011 PD survey	16 (76) adequate results-oriented frameworks (21%)	19% joint missions 43% joint analytical work PFM: 48%, procurement: 44% (2010)

methodology, statistics > systemic issues

2. Background and rationale (iv)

- Chicken & egg dilemma
- Solution? two-track approach
 - **building & strengthening of recipient M&E system: LT**
 - first step: diagnosis of what exists already
 - **satisfaction of short-term M&E accountability & learning needs**
 - 'complementary' M&E exercises conform PD principles
 - interim & adaptive

3. Assessment tool

- no existing comprehensive M&E diagnosis tool (\leftrightarrow PEFA)
- own tool: 6 main topics subdivided over 34 subtopics (see annex)
 - Policy
 - Indicators, data collection and methodology
 - Organisation: structure and linkages
 - Capacity
 - Participation of actors outside government
 - Use
- combination of quantitative & qualitative assessment
 - 5-point scoring system
 - qualitative analysis

4. Findings for Rwanda and Uganda

4.1. Progress on Paris Declaration indicators

4.2. SWOT Rwanda

4.3. SWOT Uganda

4.1. Progress on Paris Declaration indicators

	Rwanda		Uganda	
	2005	2010	2005	2010
<i>Alignment</i>				
PFM	39%	50%	60%	66%
Procurement	46%	64%	54%	43%
<i>Harmonisation</i>				
Joint missions	9%	44%	17%	24%
Joint analytical work	36%	82%	40%	56%
<i>Managing for results</i>				
Results-oriented frameworks	C	C	B	C

4.2. SWOT Rwanda

M&E policy and organisation

<p>STRENGTHS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • components of M&E policy & plan exist • components of M&E system exist • ↑ of vertical integration among M&E at MoH and central EDPRS (vertical upward integration) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ EDPRS M&E focal point at MoH 	<p>WEAKNESSES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no unified M&E policy, strategy, plan • no M&E oversight unit <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > fragmentation & reformitis block implementation • overlapping, unclear division of mandates -> tensions over health sector M&E leadership • central > local
<p>OPPORTUNITIES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • decentralisation opens opportunities for more autonomous local level (participatory) M&E <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ elaboration of district development plan ➢ joint action and development forum (JADF) ➢ use of citizen report cards ➢ use of service satisfaction surveys 	<p>THREATS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • lack of fiscal decentralisation limits local level discretion in planning and budgeting • JADF becomes instrument to control local level NGOs

Indicators, data collection and methodology

STRENGTHS

- MONITORING framework well established
 - indicators, targets and baselines
- harmonisation efforts
- prioritisation efforts
- data collection
- SIS, Tracnet, NISR (census, surveys),
- ↑ quality and exchange efforts

- ↑ of vertical integration among MoH and local level (vertical downward integration) in terms of data collection

WEAKNESSES

- lack of EVALUATION (analysis)
 - ← lack of disaggregation
 - ← lack of causal chains of indicators
 - ← lack of qualitative data
 - ← little cross-reading among data sources

 - low analytical quality of M&E output
 - weakens learning
 - weakens quality of JHSR
- central > local level
 - identification of indicators
 - upwards information flows > downward feedback

OPPORTUNITIES

- need for analysis and disaggregation will arise if progress in health sector outcomes slows down

THREATS

- indicatorism
- renewed proliferation of data collection
- management by results > management for results

Participation of actors outside government (i)

STRENGTHS

- several fora for exchange among government & (parallel) donor M&E systems exist

WEAKNESSES

- existing fora not optimally used
 - limited linkage TWG – HSCG → ↓ evidence-based policy dialogue
 - linkage TWGs – JHSR underexploited
 - fora focus more on forward looking dimensions (planning) than backward looking (reporting, M&E)
 - little analysis of sector systems (systemic issues not enough on agenda) → lack of coordinated capacity building of M&E system
- limited effective participation of domestic accountability actors
- advantage of access to different types of data & different aid modalities not enough grasped

Participation of actors outside government (ii)

OPPORTUNITIES

- set up of single project implementation unit might reduce parallel donor M&E
- TWG reform opens opportunities for improved functioning of exchange fora
- set up of TWG health policy, planning, M&E
 - might increase focus on systemic issues
 - might increase coordinated capacity building of system
 - might increase linkage between TWG as a day to day M&E instrument and the JHSR which is organised twice a year
- start up of action research with local level universities and researchers
 - increase evidence base & evidence-based policy dialogue
 - capacity building of local universities & researchers

THREATS

- reduced parallel donor M&E limits evidence base and creates biases if government's M&E lacks independence and M&E of non-state actors remains underdeveloped

Use of M&E information (i)

STRENGTHS

- ad-hoc use of M&E for feedback and learning exists (see increase in average health outcomes)
 - commitment to evidence-based decision-making
 - linkage M&E – planning
 - strong leadership and reactivity
- strong internal (government) accountability
 - particularly local to central
- performance contracts ('imihigo')
- PBF
- some spaces for critical reflection outside government exist
 - e.g. International Research for Peace and Democracy (IRDP)

WEAKNESSES

- no systematic learning
 - not on sensitive issues (e.g. claims of inequality, exclusiveness)
 - control blocks innovation
 - so far more feedback/learning at central level
- limited accountability to the outside (upward and downward)
 - level of independence of oversight M&E unit unclear
 - vague M&E dissemination strategy
 - limited parliamentary oversight
 - limited state-society interaction
- existing room of manoeuvre not optimally used by actors outside government
 - difficult balance between self-censorship and confrontation

Use of M&E information (ii)

OPPORTUNITIES

- decentralisation opens opportunities for more local level evidence-based decision-making
- integration of citizen's voice in performance contracts opens opportunities for local level accountability to citizen's
- action research increases independent evidence base and may be used in policy dialogue
- opportunities for networking and bridging among M&E of different actors outside government (CSOs, researchers, national evaluation societies, etc.)

THREATS

- lack of fiscal decentralisation blocks local level use of M&E

4.3. SWOT Uganda

M&E policy and organisation(i)

STRENGTHS

- well-elaborated M&E plan for HSSIP
- in M&E plan separate attention to M and E
- unit for M&E coordination and oversight exists: QAD
- vertical integration (upwards and downwards) satisfactory on paper
- focus on upward accountability
 - district league table
 - discussion on PBF

WEAKNESSES

- first M&E plan despite long existence SWAp
- relation between M and E not clearly spelled out
- power of QAD curtailed
 - location too low in hierarchy
 - understaffed
 - M&E unit not yet operational
- weak M&E capacity
- vertical integration hampered:
 - complex interaction between different national players (upwards integration)
 - poorly coordinated and planned supervision visits (downwards integration)
- upward accountability undermined by lack of data control
- information flow upwards, no feedback downwards

M&E policy and organisation (ii)

OPPORTUNITIES

- fragmentation of M&E is recognised -> efforts for coordination
 - inclusion of strategies for capacity development in NHPII and HSSIP
- use of PBF
 - preferably first as pilot

THREATS

- limited/ no implementation of M&E plan
 - no funds yet available for implementation
 - Uganda's track record in policy evaporation
- most of the documented side-effects (crowding out, gaming) likely apply if PBF is introduced in present context

Joint Review Meeting (JRM) and pre-JRM mission

STRENGTHS

- broad based participation from different stakeholders in JRM
- room for criticism and discussion
- use of pre-JRM field missions
 - discussion of many topics, plus reality checks
 - open atmosphere during interviews
 - immediate feedback, discussion and recommendations (↑ use)

WEAKNESSES

- lack of attention to systemic issues -> limited understanding of lack of progress in health sector outcomes
 - health sector M&E system not on the agenda -> quality of system affects quality of performance report -> main input in JRM
- topics of pre-JRM mission do not include M&E related issues (e.g. data collection, quality of data, use of data)
- pre-JRM mission focus on monitoring at local level, no analysis -> problems at other levels influencing lower levels not brought into the picture

OPPORTUNITIES

- participation of non-traditional donors
 - break down of own M&E systems, or at least:
 - adjustment of own M&E systems to enrich overall JSR

THREATS

- lack of attention to systemic issues
 - boost parallel M&E processes
 - undermine M&E reform agenda

Indicators, data collection and methodology(i)

STRENGTHS

- limited number (26) core performance indicators in HSSIP
 - baselines and targets included
 - clear selection criteria
 - different levels specified
 - data source specified
- strong quality of population-based surveys
- M&E plan highlights use of combination of quantitative and qualitative methods
- existence of several studies on Uganda's health sector which use RCTs

WEAKNESSES

- baselines and targets are not realistic
- lack of EVALUATION (analysis)
 - ← lack of disaggregation
 - ← lack of causal chains of indicators
 - ← lack of qualitative facility based data (incl. HMIS)
 - ← little cross-reading among data sources
- low analytical quality of M&E output
- weakens learning
- weakens quality of JRM
- no specification of specific methodologies
- RCT studies not integrated in sector M&E

Indicators, data collection and methodology (ii)

OPPORTUNITIES

- increasing attention to data quality
 - project with UBOS to improve data quality
 - National Quality Improvement Framework and Strategic Plan
 - establishment of a separate HMIS TWG
- comparative analysis through district league table

THREATS

- lack of funds (and incentives) to validate data quality

Participation of actors outside government (i)

STRENGTHS

- involvement of donors in elaboration of M&E plan -> increases use of plan

- existence of CSO initiatives for community based monitoring (e.g. Uganda Debt Network)

- active Office of the Auditor General
 - financial, value for money and other audits

WEAKNESSES

- limited interest of donors in financing M&E -> more interest in disease related issues and PFM

- not much coherence and discussion between donors

- most CSO participating in SWAp are weak
 - poor quality of input
 - anecdotal evidence

- linkages between outside government actors underdeveloped
 - no use of comparative advantage
 - information from community based monitoring hardly used by parliament and donors

Participation of actors outside government (ii)

OPPORTUNITIES

- active, critical young Parliamentarians in new Parliament with higher reading culture
 - increasing use of M&E reports
- support of domestic accountability actors in portfolio approach
 - combination of developing capacity with increasing the room of manoeuvre domestic actors and use of local level information by donors

THREATS

- new Parliamentarians curtailed by government party
- more influence of donors in M&E compared to national outside government stakeholders -> sustainability into perspective

Use of M&E information

<p>STRENGTHS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •improvement of quality of M&E output: AHSPR •attention to data use in M&E plan •some use of data for planning at central level and local level 	<p>WEAKNESSES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •shortcomings AHSPR with regard to analytical quality -> ↓ usefulness •no systematic or institutionalised use of data
<p>OPPORTUNITIES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •new incentives for using data <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢district league tables ➢yearly retreat with president 	<p>THREATS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •deficient M&E demand effects supply and sustainability of the system

5. Conclusions (i)

- health sector M&E systems in both Rwanda and Uganda are moderately developed
- some similarities
 - fragmentation and reformitis
 - established monitoring framework
 - focus on data collection & monitoring at expense of evaluation and analysis
 - surveys, census (statistics) > HMIS
 - sequencing strategy ?
 - evaluation: politically & methodologically challenging
 - upward flow of information > downward feedback & use
 - government –donor exchange and review fora exist but not optimally used

5. Conclusions (ii)

- some differences

	Rwanda	Uganda
Accountability	strong inside government accountability (from local to central)	stronger domestic accountability actors
Learning	strong ad-hoc learning and reactivity but not systematic and not on sensitive topics (sustainable?)	useful ad-hoc analyses but feedback channels not functional (policy evaporation)

6. Questions and answers

Thank you!

nathalie.holvoet@ua.ac.be
liesbeth.inberg@ua.ac.be



Annex 1. Checklist M&E system at sector level (i)

Policy

	Topic	Question
1	M&E plan	Is there a comprehensive M&E plan, indicating what to evaluate, why, how, for whom?
2	M versus E	Is the difference and the relationship between M and E clearly spelled out?
3	Autonomy & impartiality (accountability)	Is the need for autonomy and impartiality explicitly mentioned? Does the M&E plan allow for tough issues to be analysed? Is there an independent budget?
4	Feedback	Is there an explicit and consistent approach to reporting, dissemination, integration?
5	Alignment planning & budgeting	Is there integration of M&E results in planning and budgeting?

Indicators, data collection and methodology

	Topic	Question
6	Selection of indicators	Is it clear what to monitor and evaluate? Is there a list of indicators? Are sector indicators harmonised with the PRSP indicators?
7	Quality of indicators	Are indicators SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, time-bound)? Are baselines and targets attached?
8	Disaggregation	Are indicators disaggregated by sex, region, socio-economic status?
9	Selection criteria	Are the criteria for the selection of indicators clear? Is it clear who is involved in the selection?
10	Priority setting	Is the need acknowledged to set priorities and limit the number of indicators to be monitored?
11	Causality chain	Are different levels of indicators (input-output-outcome-impact) explicitly linked (program theory)? (vertical logic)
12	Methodologies used	Is it clear how to monitor and evaluate? Are methodologies well identified and mutually integrated?
13	Data collection	Are sources of data collection clearly identified? Are indicators linked to sources of data collection? (horizontal logic)

Organisation: structure

	Topic	Question
14	Coordination and oversight	Is there an appropriate institutional structure for coordination, support, oversight, analyses of data and feedback at the sector level? With different stakeholders? What is its location?
15	Joint Sector Review	Does the JSR cover accountability and learning needs for both substance and systemic issues? What is the place/linkage of the JSR within the sector M&E system? Does the JSR promote the reform agenda of the Paris Declaration?
16	Sector Working groups	Are sector working groups active in monitoring? Is their composition stable? Are various stakeholders represented?
17	Ownership	Does the demand for (strengthening of the) M&E system come from the sector ministry, a central ministry (e.g. ministry of planning or finance) or from external actors (e.g. donors)? Is there a highly placed 'champion' within the sector ministry who advocates for the (strengthening of the) M&E system?
18	Incentives	Are incentives (at central and local level) used to stimulate data collection and data use?

Organisation: linkages

	Topic	Question
19	Linkage with Statistical office	Is there a linkage between sector M&E and the statistical office? Is the role of the statistical office in sector M&E clear?
20	'Horizontal' integration	Are there M&E units in different sub-sectors and semi-governmental institutions? Are these properly linked to the sector's central unit?
21	'Vertical' upward integration	Is the sector M&E unit properly linked to the central M&E unit (PRS monitoring system)?
22	'Vertical' downward integration	Are there M&E units at decentralised levels and are these properly linked to the sector M&E unit?
23	Link with projects	Is there any effort to coordinate with donor M&E mechanism for projects and vertical funds in the sector?

Capacity

	Topic	Question
24	Present capacity	What is the present capacity of the M&E unit at central sector level, sub-sector level and decentralised level (e.g. fte, skills, financial resources)?
25	Problem acknowledged	Are current weaknesses in the system identified?
26	Capacity building plan	Are there plans/activities for remediation? Do these include training, appropriate salaries, etc.?

Participation of actors outside government

	Topic	Question
27	Parliament	Is the role of Parliament properly recognised, and is there alignment with Parliamentary control and oversight procedures? Does Parliament participate in Joint Sector Reviews and/ or sector working groups?
28	Civil Society	Is the role of civil society recognised? Are there clear procedures for the participation of civil society? Is the participation institutionally arranged or rather ad-hoc? Does civil society participate in Joint Sector Reviews and/ or sector working groups?
29	Donors	Is the role of donors recognised? Are there clear procedures for participation of donors? Do donors participate in Joint Sector Reviews and/ or sector working groups?

Use of M&E outputs

	Topic	Question
30	M&E outputs	Is there a presentation of relevant M&E results? Are results compared to targets? Is there an analysis of discrepancies? Is the M&E output differentiated towards different audiences?
31	Effective use of M&E by donors	Are donors using the outputs of the sector M&E system for their information needs? Is the demand for M&E data from donors coordinated?
32	Effective use of M&E at central level	Are results of M&E activities used for internal purposes? Is it an instrument of policy-making and/or policy-influencing and advocacy at central level?
33	Effective use of M&E at local level	Are results of M&E activities used for internal purposes? Is it an instrument of policy-making and/or policy-influencing and advocacy at local level?
34	Effective use of M&E by outside government actors	Are results of M&E used as an instrument to hold government accountable?

Annex 2. Selected references

- Holvoet, N. and Inberg, L. (2011) - Sector monitoring and evaluation systems in the context of changing aid modalities : the case of Niger's health sector Antwerp: UA, Institute of Development Policy and Management, 2011.- 64 p. - (IOB working paper ; 2011:02).
- Holvoet, N. and Inberg, L. (2011) - Stocktaking and assessing M&E arrangements in Rwanda's health sector : evidence from desk and field study Antwerp: UA, Institute of Development Policy and Management, 2011.- 65 p.
- Holvoet, N. and Inberg, L. (2009) - Joint sector reviews: M&E experiments in an era of changing aid modalities: experiences from JSRs in the education sectors of Burkina Faso, Mali and Niger *Public administration and development* - 29 (3): 204-217.
- Holvoet, N. and Rombouts, H. (2008) - The challenge of monitoring and evaluation under the new aid modalities: experiences from Rwanda - *Journal of modern African studies* – 46 (4): 577-602.
- Holvoet, N. and Renard, R. (2007) - Monitoring and evaluation under the PRSP: solid rock or quicksand? *Evaluation and program planning* – 30 (1): 66-81.

Website O* platform: www.ua.ac.be/dev/bos