

Sector monitoring and evaluation systems

A comparison between the M&E systems in the health sectors of Rwanda and Uganda

EES conference , 5th of October 2012

Nathalie Holvoet & Liesbeth Inberg
Institute of Development Policy and Management
University of Antwerp
Belgium

Content

1. Introduction
2. Assessment tool
3. Findings for Rwanda and Uganda
4. Conclusions

Annexes

1. Checklist M&E system at sector level
2. Selection of publications

1. Introduction

1. Introduction (i)

- M&E reform agenda
 - recipients: establish results-oriented M&E system (see PD indicator 11)
 - donors: harmonisation and alignment

1. Introduction(ii)

progress in implementation of reform agenda

	Total		Rwanda		Uganda	
	2005	2010	2005	2010	2005	2010
Alignment						
PFM	40%	48%	39%	50%	60%	66%
Procurement	39%	44%	46%	64%	54%	43%
Harmonisation						
Joint missions	18%	19%	9%	44%	17%	24%
Joint analytical work	42%	43%	36%	82%	40%	56%
Managing for results						
Results-oriented frameworks	2 out of 44 (5%)	16 out of 76 (21%)	C	C	B	C

→ methodology, statistics > systemic issues

1. Introduction(iii)

- Chicken & egg dilemma
- Solution? two-track approach
 - building & strengthening of recipient M&E system: LT
 - satisfaction of short-term M&E accountability & learning needs

2. 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

3. Findings for Rwanda and Uganda

M&E policy

- Uganda: well-elaborated M&E plan
Rwanda: components of M&E policy & plan
- Emphasis in both countries on accountability, especially upwards
 - Uganda accountability undermined by lack of data control -> unreliable data
 - Rwanda: data controlled in context of performance-based financing + strong intra-governmental accountability

Indicators, data collection and methodology

- Monitoring components well developed
 - identification of indicators with baselines and targets
 - set up of various data collection sources

- Lack of evaluation (analyses)
 - <- little cross-reading among data sources
 - <- lack of disaggregation
 - <- lack of causal chains of indicators
 - <- lack of qualitative facility based data (incl. HMIS)

- > low analytical quality of M&E output
- > weakens learning
- > weakens quality of joint sector review

Organisation and capacity

- Rwanda: no M&E oversight unit

Uganda: Quality Assurance Department -> power curtailed

- Rwanda: ↑ of vertical upward integration among M&E at MoH and central EDPRS

Uganda: vertical upward integration hampered

- Limited M&E capacity, but in Rwanda strengthened at local level

Participation of actors outside government (i)

- CSOs
 - Limited effective participation
 - In Uganda interesting CSO initiatives for community based monitoring

- Parliament
 - Hardly involved in Rwanda
 - More active in Uganda, including active Office of the Auditor General

Participation of actors outside government (ii)

- Development partners
 - Existence of several fora for exchange among government and (parallel) donor M&E systems -> not optimally used
 - Uganda: limited interest of donors, but involvement in elaboration of M&E plan
- Linkages between outside government actors underdeveloped
 - No use of comparative advantages
 - In Uganda information from community based monitoring hardly used by Parliament and donors

Use of M&E information

- No systematic or institutionalised use of data
- Rwanda: performance based financing -> ↑ use of data
- Uganda: new incentives for using data
- Budget support donors use information from MoH

4. Conclusions (i)

- health sector M&E systems in both Rwanda and Uganda are moderately developed
- some similarities
 - established monitoring framework
 - focus on data collection & monitoring at expense of evaluation and analysis
 - upward flow of information > downward feedback & use
 - government –donor exchange and review fora exist but not optimally used

4. Conclusions (ii)

- some differences

	Rwanda	Uganda
Accountability	strong inside government accountability (from local to central)	stronger domestic accountability actors
	currently ongoing academic debate on comparative effectiveness	
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)

Thank you!

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



Annex 1. Checklist M&E system at sector level

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. Uganda's scores on the Checklist M&E system at sector level

	Topic	Score
Policy		
1	M&E plan	4
2	M versus E	2
3	Autonomy & impartiality (accountability)	2
4	Feedback	2
5	Alignment planning & budgeting	2
Indicators, data collection and methodology		
6	Selection of indicators	4
7	Quality of indicators	3
8	Disaggregation	2
9	Selection criteria	3
10	Priority setting	3
11	Causality chain	3
12	Methodologies used	2
13	Data collection	4

	Topic	Score
Organisation: structure		
14	Coordination and oversight	3
15	Joint Sector Review	3
16	Sector Working groups	2
17	Ownership	3
18	Incentives	2
Organisation: linkages		
19	Linkage with Statistical office	4
20	'Horizontal' integration	2
21	'Vertical' upward integration	3
22	'Vertical' downward integration	3
23	Link with projects	3

	Topic	Score
Capacity		
24	Present capacity	1
25	Problem acknowledged	3
26	Capacity building plan	2
Participation of actors outside government		
27	Parliament	2
28	Civil Society	2
29	Donors	3
Use of M&E outputs		
30	M&E outputs	3
31	Effective use of M&E by donors	3
32	Effective use of M&E at central level	2
33	Effective use of M&E at local level	1
34	Effective use of M&E by outside government actors	1

Annex 3. Selection of publications

- 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 - ISSN 0271-2075 – 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 - ISSN 0022-278X – 46 (4): 577-602.
- Holvoet, N. and Renard, R. (2007) - Monitoring and evaluation under the PRSP: solid rock or quicksand? Evaluation and program planning - ISSN 0149-7189 – 30 (1): 66-81.

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