REPORT
Testing the Sector Track Record during the Joint Health Sector Review in Rwanda

24/11-26/11/2008

Liesbeth Inberg § Nathalie Holvoet

BOS-PRSP
Institute for Development Policy and Management
Universiteit Antwerpen
Lange Sint Annastraat 7
2000 Antwerpen
www.ua.ac.be/iob/dev/bos

1.   Introduction

Liesbeth Inberg from the Institute of Development Policy and Management (IOB) participated in the Joint Health Sector Review (JHSR) of Rwanda, which took place in Kigali from 24th until 26th November 2008, with the aim of identifying the possible need for support in monitoring and evaluation (M&E) within the health sector. Because the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs is currently verifying if the Sector Track Record (STR) could be useful for joint sector reviews (JSR) and vice versa, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and IOB saw interesting opportunities for cooperation.

The objective of the assignment is to formulate answers to the following questions:
-   To which extent does the JHSR provide answers to the questions included in the STR?
-   Does the JHSR also treat subjects that are not covered by the STR? If yes, which ones? Is it recommended to include them into the STR?
-   Is the procedure followed during the observation of this JSR recommendable for future 'learning assessments'?

This report consists of four sections: in section two the objectives and organization of the JHSR are described, in section three the scores on the questions of the STR are presented, in section four the use of STR for improvement of the JHSR (and visa versa) is assessed and in section five recommendations for learning assessments are given.

2.   Objectives and organization of JHSR

The JHSR 2008, which was the third JSR in the health sector in Rwanda, took place in Kigali from 24th until 26th November. There were around 100 participants (participation list not (yet) available), representing different stakeholders: MoH, districts, (I)NGOs, United Nations and bilateral donors. The new minister of Health, Dr. Richard Sezibera, was present during the whole JHSR. The JHSR was organized by the M&E Task Force in cooperation with the Planning, Policies and Capacity Building Unit. Because translations were available, participants could choose to speak either French or English.

The general objective of the JHSR in 2008 was to assess the health sector performance in 2008 at all levels under the leadership of the Ministry of Health, and to identify priorities for 2009 (see ToR of the JHSR).

Specific objectives were:
1. Provide a review of progress on the implementation of recommendations from last year's sector review
2. Generate a common understanding among all stakeholders on the current situation of the health sector
3. Present progress made along the Joint Annual Work Plan (including relevant goals and indicators of MDG 4, 5 and 6; EDPRS (CPAF/Policy Matrix); HSSPI; TWG), identify bottlenecks and provide major options for strategies and future interventions (HSSPII, Joint Annual Action Plan 2009)
4. Present the financial year 01/01/2008–30/06/2009 MTEF and review progress and assess the overall performance of the health sector against budget disbursement
5. Provide an update on the SWAp process
6. Verify the fulfilment of mutual conditionalities set for the Sector Budget Support

During the 2,5 days of the 2008 JHSR PowerPoint presentations were given by different stakeholders, followed by discussion. The JHSR was officially opened by the minister of Health, after which the progress against the recommendations of the 2007 JHSR was presented. After the introductory session, in which the HSSPII was presented, three plenary sessions followed
    -       session 1: review of MDGs 4,5 and 6
    -       session 2: resources (financial, human and infrastructure/ equipment)
    -       session 3: governance & coordination (SWAp, SBS, CDPF and decentralization)
In the concluding session the participants were split up in four groups in order to formulate a set of main recommendations for each of the three sessions and for the HSSPII. These recommendations were discussed on the last morning of the JHSR. The JHSR was closed by the Minister of Health.

In contrast with what is prescribed in the MoU, no progress report, budget execution report, or report on donor performance were provided in advance or during the JHSR. Thus, the PowerPoint presentations were the only source of information for the participants. Despite guidelines which were sent to presenters in advance, including general presentation guidelines prescribing for example use of font size of at least 20 to 24 points and a maximum of five bullet points on any slide, many PowerPoint presentations were unreadable, especially the ones presenting statistical information.

3.   Questions included in the Sector Track Record
The STR is a tool developed by the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs for systematically analysing and monitoring key aspects of a sector or sub-sector supported by the Dutch embassy. The STR consists of four clusters; three policy clusters which are divided into two components and a cluster dealing with results, thus in total seven components:
sA1: Quality of the sectoral strategy and underlying analysis
sA2: Commitment and support to the strategy
sB1: Financial and human resource base
sB2: Actual deployment of human and financial resources
sC1: Institutional and organisational capacity
sC2: Governance and accountability
sD: Achievement of sector results

The Sector Track Record User Guide provides key questions for each component and auxiliary questions which are helpful in answering the key questions. For the embassy it is not obligatory to answer all the separate auxiliary questions.

Within this assignment we verified *if* the JHSR could provide answers to the questions, including the auxiliary ones. We did not provide the specific answers themselves.

Each question was scored with a 0, 1 or 2, meaning:
0   no information is provided to answer the question
1   some information is provided, but it is not sufficient to provide a sound answer to the question
2   sufficient information is provided to answer the question

It should be noted that a score 2 does not mean that the answer to the question is positive, only that the question can be answered with the information provided in the JHSR. For example; score 2 on sD1-1 does not mean that there is a transparent and monitorable performance assessment framework in place, only that after the JHSR you know if it is or not.

Because no input documents were made available before and during the JHSR, the only sources of information of the JHSR itself are the PowerPoint presentations and the discussions. These sources formed the starting point for the assessment. If questions were scored with a '0' or a '1', the new Health Sector Strategy Plan was consulted and if the information provided in this document could not increase the score to '2', the external evaluation of the HSSP I was consulted. In practice, only for a few questions the HSSP II and the evaluation improved the score. The annex provides detailed information for each of the auxiliary questions. The table below presents the scores for the key questions, which are the averages of the scores on the auxiliary questions.

Table 1. Scoring on key questions

Cluster sA1: How do you rate the quality of the sectoral strategy?	
sA1-1: Is an operational development strategy for the sector in place?	2
sA1-2: Is the sector strategy evidence-based and informed by institutional analyses?	2
sA1-3: Is the sector strategy coherent and consistent, internally?	2
sA1-4: Is the strategy properly prioritised and costed?	2
sA1-5: How would you rate the feasibility of the plan?	1
Cluster sA2: What is the level of (political) commitment and support to the strategy?	
sA2-1: To what extent is the strategy the result of an endogenous process?	2
sA2-2: How would you describe the degree of political endorsement for the sector strategy at different levels?	1
sA2-3: To what extent have relevant stakeholders outside central government participated in the formulation of the strategy?	1

Cluster sB1: Is there an adequate financial and human resource base for the strategy?	
sB1-1: Is (i) the resource envelope sufficient for an optimal implementation of the strategy?	1
Is (ii) the human resource pool sufficient for an optimal implementation of the strategy?	1
Is (iii) their distribution sufficient for an optimal implementation of the strategy?	1
sB1-2: Are aid flows aligned on national priorities?	1
sB1-3: Do non-state service providers avail of sufficient financial and human resources?	0
Cluster sB2: Is the actual deployment of human and financial resources in line with strategy and plan?	

B2-1: Have budgeted funds and resources been deployed and utilised in line with the plan in recent years?	1
sB2-2: Are aid disbursements released according to agreed schedules?	1

Cluster sC1: How would you rate the institutional and organisational capacity?	
sC1-1: Are institutional arrangements in the sector clearly spelled out, including the division of roles between central and decentral levels, public and private sector?	2
sC1-2: How do you assess the public sector administrative and management systems at national and subnational levels and their functioning?	1
sC1-3: What is the role of non-state actors in the sector and their capacity for service delivery and influencing policies?	1
sC1-4: Do donors strengthen national capacity by using country systems? and/or providing harmonised support, including to capacity development?	1
Cluster sC2: Are the basic conditions for good governance fulfilled?	
C2-1: Which domestic accountability mechanisms exist? How do they function in support of equitable service delivery?	0
sC2-2: What are the main issues hampering good governance?	0
Which forms of corruption affect the sector?	0
How are they addressed?	0

Cluster sD: Does the sector achieve the envisaged results?	
sD1-1: Is there a transparent and monitorable performance assessment framework in place to assess progress against the sector programme at different levels?	2
sD1-2: What is the actual progress on key indicators with respect to	
- access?	2
- coverage?	2
- utilisation?	2
- quality?	2
- equity?	1
sD1-3: How would you interpret progress as captured in the statistics?	2
sD1-4: If not included in the (quantitative) indicators, how would you rate the quality of service delivery and any equity issues in this respect?	0
sD1-5 Have any relevant (impact) evaluations been undertaken in the sector?	1

The table shows that information was particularly provided for clusters A and D. It is noteworthy to mention that the scores for the questions in cluster A improved substantially after having consulted HSSP II. Because HSSP II is a new strategy, not yet formally approved of, one could conclude that the HSSP II should have been discussed during the JHSR in such a way that answers were given during the JHSR and not only after having read the HSSP II. When a new strategy was already discussed during a previous review, it is quite logical that it should not be thoroughly discussed during every review.

As far as clusters B and C are concerned, scores are either '0' or '1'; the only time we scored '2' was for question sC1-1 and this is the result of the consultation of the HSSP II. Particularly the low scores in cluster B are remarkable, because one of the three sessions of the JHSR was devoted to resources. From the table in annex, it is clear that there are variances in the scores on the auxiliary questions, with for example scores of '0', '1' and '2' on questions related to sB1-1 (i). Whereas an answer could be given on the question regarding the share of public expenditure in the total sector, information on translation of the strategy into realistic, predictable, multi year financing framework, matched with available resources is (not yet) available. Noteworthy is the lack of attention for non-state service providers, especially because representatives of different organizations were present during the JHSR.

Despite the organisation of a session on governance & coordination, there are only scores '0' in cluster sC2. However, when looking at the agenda of the JHSR it is quite clear that governance is only in the title of the session and not an issue that was discussed during the session. Within this session there were presentations on the Sector wide approach (SWAp), Sector Budget Support (SBS), Capacity Development Pooled Fund (CDPF) and decentralization. Particularly regarding key question sC2-2, it should be noted that the auxiliary questions are only related to corruption. As Rwanda scores quite positively in reports of Transparency International and claims there is hardly any corruption, it is not surprising that there is no attention for the issue of corruption.

4. Use of the STR for the improvement of the JHSR (and visa versa)

Because the JHSR was quite superficial, caused by the lack of input documents and the fact that is was more a forward looking event (focused on formulating recommendations), it is not surprising that the JHSR did not cover topics which are not addressed in the STR, except for one small issue. There is an auxiliary question (under B2-1) on budget execution, while the simple question on the actual budget execution rate is not included in the STR. During the JHSR and also in the evaluation of HSSP I, the improvements in budget execution rates have been used to demonstrate the absorption capacity of the sector.

On the other hand, the STR could certainly feed into the improvement of the JHSR. The assessment of the extent to which STR's key questions and auxiliary questions were answered through the JHSR, made clear that currently the JHSR does not provide an in-depth insight on the different clusters. To give an example, when examining the issues discussed during the JHSR, one could conclude that quite a lot of attention and time was spent on financial and human resources as one of the three main sessions was on resources. However, by answering for example the questions under cluster B, one could conclude otherwise. Data on disbursements was for example provided, but was it timely and complete? Is there an appropriate gender balance in the human resource pool? By filling in the table, going through each of the auxiliary questions, it became clear that some of the issues were only discussed superficially. When input reports are available in advance (as usually is the case in joint sector reviews), embassy staff or sector groups could use the STR in order to prepare their participation in the JSR. Using the STR could be particularly useful as to identify the gaps in the information base and as guide for a more in-depth and critical analysis of the available document base used in the JSR.

However, one critical comment on the STR deserves to be made: on the one hand there are too many questions, while, on the other hand, some of the auxiliary questions, which are not obligatory, are of such an importance that they should rather be transformed into key questions. This is particularly the case for question sC1-2, under which for example auxiliary questions on the procurement and public finance management system and management information systems fall. These questions, although already underlined in the STR, deserve a more distinctive focus in the STR.

Besides, some of the auxiliary questions do not completely provide an answer to the key question. As already mentioned above, the auxiliary questions under sC2-2 are limited to corruption, while more issues could be at stake here. If for example the JHSR would have paid attention to corruption, by answering the auxiliary questions under sC2-2, one could

have concluded that there are no main issues hampering good governance in the health sector in Rwanda. One may question whether this is really the case.

5.   Recommendations for the learning assessment

This assignment focused on the JSR in the health sector as it was a spin-off of the author's participation in this joint sector review. However, the Netherlands is not active in the health sector in Rwanda and were not participating in the JHSR. Therefore the first logical recommendation for future learning assessments is to focus on JSRs in sectors in countries where the Netherlands is active.

In the Task Concept Note on shared analysis of sector performance of the Sector Support Working Group of SPA, the STR is not specifically mentioned. However, the method used in this assignment, scoring the questions of the STR, could be used in a learning assessment as well. This could also be a way to internationalize the STR. Although there are many questions in the STR, it is advisable to include all questions, in order to assure a necessary level of depth in JSRs (as mentioned in the paragraph above). Because not all auxiliary questions are of the same importance, the scores could be weighted as to give more weight to certain questions.

Whereas it could be advantageous for staff of embassies to do the assessments themselves, as this is cheaper and also gives the opportunity to cover more JSRs, it remains expedient to involve external experts in the assessments, as the latter might add a more independent and objective insight. It also offers opportunities to compare scores of experts with those of staff of the embassies and it is a useful basis for discussion among experts and embassy staff on the issue of STRs, JSRs and more generally on 'monitoring and evaluation'.

A last recommendation is to perform the action research[1], mentioned in the Task Concept Note, in the same sectors and countries in which the learning assessments are performed; in this way the results of the learning assessments can directly feed into the action research.

---

[1] In the action research the consultant is used to facilitate the sector review process

Annex: Scoring on auxiliary questions

Cluster A

	JHSR	Other	Score
Cluster sA1: How do you rate the quality of the sectoral strategy?			
sA1-1: Is an operational development strategy for the sector in place? What is the scope of the strategy?			
- Does the sector cover an entire sector?	2		
- Which areas are not covered?	-		
- Does the sector strategy encompass the role of all major service providers/ stakeholders or is it limited to the private sector?	2		
- What does this imply for overall sector performance and poverty reduction?	0	HSSP II	1
- Does the strategy take the interest and/or service delivery needs of all groups in society into account, including the poor and marginalized?	2		
sA1-2: Is the sector strategy evidence-based and informed by institutional analyses?			
- Is the strategy based on adequate knowledge of grassroot realities?	1	HSSP II	2
- Have lessons learned from previous policies been incorporated?	1	HSSP II	2
- Is (inter)national knowledge and local and global good practice taken into account?	1		
How would you describe the quality of the analysis?			
- Is the sector strategy based on solid analysis and does it focus on key reform issues?	0	HSSP II	2
sA1-3: Is the sector strategy coherent and consistent, internally?			
- Does the sector strategy consolidate the plans for different subsectors and reflect on linkages between them?	0	HSSP II	2
- Do operational plans adequately reflect the priorities identified in the policy/strategy?	0	HSSP II	2
and externally?			
- Are sector strategy objectives linked to the priorities set in the overall poverty reduction strategy (PRSP)?	2		
- Are there regular consultations between the ministry responsible for the coordination of the PRSP and the sector ministry?	0		
- Are cross-cutting issues, such as gender, environment and natural resource management, SRGR and hiv/aids taken into account (where appropriate)?	0	HSSP II	1
- Is the strategy coordinated with other sector strategies?	0		
- Is the strategy coordinated with other reform processes at macro level such as decentralisation policies or civil service reform?	2		
sA1-4: Is the strategy properly prioritised and costed?			
- Does the strategy set out clear priorities?	2		
- Are reform initiatives sequenced in line with available capacity and have trade-offs (based on analysis) been explicitly made?	1		
- Is the strategy adequately costed?	0		
- Does the strategy include measures for increased efficiency?	2		
- Does the strategy provide sufficient guidance for donor investments?	1		
sA1-5: How would you rate the feasibility of the plan?			
- Are the targets realistic vis-à-vis the current situation in terms of existing - capacities and available financial/human resources?	1		
- Have potential risks affecting implementation been analysed and are risk mitigation measures foreseen?	1		

Cluster sA2: What is the level of (political) commitment and support to the strategy?			
sA2-1: To what extent is the strategy the result of an endogenous process?			
- *Who are key drivers of reform in the sector?*	2		
- *Does the sector strategy contribute to the empowerment of civil society and the private sector?*	1		
- *Do donors respect and strengthen partner country leadership?*	2		
- *What has been the nature of donor involvement (including consultants hired by donors) in setting priorities for the sector and drafting the sector programme which they support?*	1	HSSP II	2
- *What is the role of explicit or hidden donor conditionality in the sector?*	0		
sA2-2: How would you describe the degree of political endorsement for the sector strategy at different levels?			
- *Central government (line minister, minister of finance, prime minister/president); parliament and the political opposition; decentralised levels of government and elected councils; stakeholders in society*	1		
- *Has a stakeholder analysis or drivers' of change analysis for the sector been conducted, identifying strong and weaker stakeholders in support of or against sector reform?*	0		
- *Does the sector strategy pay sufficient attention to the 'politics of sector reform' and the need to harness support and overcome resistance?*	0		
sA2-3: To what extent have relevant stakeholders outside central government participated in the formulation of the strategy?			
- *Has the government created adequate conditions for stakeholder participation (e.g. dissemination of information, timely notification of meetings)? What could be improved?*	2		
- *Which groups have been actively involved in formulation? Eg., local authorities or their national associations, frontline service providers, middle management of line ministry, civil society, private sector organisation, women's organisations, users, donors, etc.*	1	HSSP II	2
- *Which important stakeholders have been excluded from the process?*	0		
- *Do key stakeholders have sufficient capacity to effectively participate in formulation?*	0		
- *Do the national strategy and plans allow sufficient space for local level decision making in line with established decentralised mandates, and responsive to local needs?*	2		

Cluster B

	JHSR	Other	Score
Cluster sB1: Is there an adequate financial and human resource base for the strategy?			
sB1-1:			
Is (i) the resource envelope sufficient for an optimal implementation of the strategy?			
- Does the government allocate adequate financial resources to the sector and the various sub-sectors, relative to the total national budget? Refer to international benchmarks if available and to domestic trends in allocation.	1		
- Is a conducive dialogue in place between the line ministry and ministry of finance and is the sector budget cycle effectively linked to the overal budgetary process/MTEF?	1		
- Has the sector strategy been translated into a realistic, predictable, multi-year financing framework, matched with available resources?	0		
- What is the share of public expenditure in the total sector?	2		
- Are financial resources allocated to subnational levels in line with local mandates (decentralisation)?	2		
- What is the share of total ODA in the total resource envelope? Would you describe this as an adequate level?	0	HSSP II	2
- Is the total resource envelope for the sector – public, private and donors - sufficient to reach the (inter)nationally agreed targets?	2		
Is (ii) the human resource pool sufficient for an optimal implementation of the strategy?			
- Is the envisaged staff establishment ("formatie") at national and subnational levels adequate for the number (e.g. student teach ratio) and mix of staff required?	1	HSSP II	2
- Is there an appropriate gender balance?	0		
- Which are the main constraints?	1		
- Are donor policies consistent with respect to sectoral ambitions and macro-economic frameworks? (eg. wage caps vs social sector targets)	0		
Is (iii) their distribution sufficient for an optimal implementation of the strategy?			
- Is the intended deployment of financial and human resources in line with service delivery needs as identified in the plan, and does this promote equitable service delivery? For example, does the government use gender budgeting techniques?	0	Evaluation	1
- Are available financial resources distributed effectively over different regions and categories: e.g. central/decentral, recurrent/capital cost, urban-rural, personnel/non personnel etc?	1	Evaluation	2
- What share of the overall resource envelope is allocated to service delivery level(s)?	0		
sB1-2: Are aid flows aligned on national priorities?			
- What share of total aid flows for the sector is 'on plan'? Also look at the behaviour of the major individual donors, including bilateral and multilateral donors, vertical funds, international ngo's	0		
- What share of these funds is earmarked for specific purposes and how much is discretionary?	0		
- How are funds not reported on plan deployed by donor agencies?	0		
- Is any progress towards more policy alignment observed?	2		
- Do government and donors take action to improve the situation?	2		
sB1-3: Do non-state service providers avail of sufficient financial and human resources?			
- Which are the main sources of funding for these service providers?	0		
- Do they receive funding from (local) government?	0		

- Do non-state service providers face staffing constraints in relation to needs?	0		
- Is donor support for non-state providers transparent, predictable, known to government and coordinated with – or even provided through – the sector programme?	0		
Cluster sB2: Is the actual deployment of human and financial resources in line with strategy and plan?			
B2-1: Have budgeted funds and resources been deployed and utilised in line with the plan in recent years?			
- Was there timely and full disbursement of budgeted funds from the Ministry of Finance to line ministries and/or to subnational levels of government?	0		
- If not, why not?			
- Are sufficient human and financial recources made available to service delivery units in a timely manner?	0		
- Were financial and human resources utilised/deployed in line with approved plans and budgets at various levels, and was this monitored adequately by the sector and finance ministry?	2		
- Does the sector use budget evaluation and tracking instruments such as PERs and PETS?	2		
- If budget execution and human resource deployment were not according to plan, what steps were undertaken to address existing weaknesses?	0		
sB2-2: Are aid disbursements released according to agreed schedules?			
- What is the predictability or volatility of donor funding?	0		
- Is aid becoming more predictable, both in-year and on a multi-year basis?	1		
- What bottlenecks are encountered in timely/full release of disbursements and what does this imply for the sector programme?	1		
- Are these issues addressed in the dialogue and are donors held to account for bad performance?	1		

Cluster C

Cluster sC1: How would you rate the institutional and organisational capacity?			
	JHSR	Other	Score
sC1-1: Are institutional arrangements in the sector clearly spelled out, including the division of roles between central and decentral levels, public and private sector?			
- *Is a clear division of role in place between key stakeholders at central level?*	1	HSSP II	2
- *How are responsibilities in the sector distributed across different levels of government?*	1	HSSP II	2
- *Is this in line with the country's decentralisation strategy, i.e. does the line ministry respect subnational mandates?*	1	HSSP II	2
- *Does the sector strategy take advantage of regional and local levels and strengthen them?*	1	HSSP II	2
- *Is there a clear idea about division of roles between the public and private sector?*	1		
- *Is there a legal and regulatory framework in place underpinning existing institutional arrangements and are these arrangements adhered to in practice?*	0		
sC1-2: How do you assess the public sector administrative and management systems at national and subnational levels and their functioning?			
- *Are the existing administrative systems and their operations supportive of equitable service delivery and development? Assess the overall capacity, at national and subnational level, in the following areas and identify key constraints:*	1		
- *[strategic and operational planning and budgeting to the extent not dealt with in clusters sA and sB]*	1		
- *Does the sector have procurement and public finance management systems that adhere to broadly accepted good practices and/or is a reform programme in place to achieve this? (**Paris indicator 2**)*	1		
- *Management Information Systems: what is their quality (reliability, relevance of information, links between adminstrative levels, feedback of data) and scope (e.g. are services provided by non-state actors included)? Are data from the sector-specific MIS combined with wider data-sets such as census or Demographic Health Surveys?*	1	HSSP II	2
- *Results orientation: is information generated through MIS and M&E systems used for policy finetuning/adjustment?*	0		
- *Human Resource Management: i.a. pre-service and in-service staff training; incentive schemes for improving productivity or encouraging staff to work in poor and remote areas; gender policy. Are personnel policies in the sector aligned with civil service reform and decentralisation policies (e.g, who is responsible for hiring and firing)?*	2		
- *Change management: do sector managers make an effort to harness stakeholder support and overcome resistance?*	0		
sC1-3: What is the role of non-state actors in the sector and their capacity for service delivery and influencing policies?			
- *Which role are non-state actors/service providers playing in the sector?*	1	HSSP II	2
- *Is this role acknowledged by government and appreciated by citizens?*	1	HSSP II	2
- *Is the cooperation between state and non-state service providers effective?*	0		
- *Are the contribution of non-state actors to the sector and their needs for capacity development addressed in the sector policy dialogue?*	0		
- *Does the sector programme envisage any measures to strengthen capacity of non-state actors? Which other initiatives are taken to achieve this?*	0		

sC1-4: Do donors strengthen national capacity by using country systems? and/or providing harmonised support, including to capacity development?			
*- What share of donor support to the sector is provided through programme-based approaches, using common arrangements or procedures? (**Paris indicator 9**)*	2		
*- Which percent of donors and what share of aid flows use partner country procurement and/or PFM systems? (**Paris indicator 5**)*	0		
- Are constraints in partner country implementation capacity (central and decentral) systematically discussed in the donor-government policy dialogue?	2		
*- Are such discussions based on shared analysis, gained through joint field missions or joint analytic work, including diagnostic reviews? (**Paris indicator 10**)*	0		
- Are donors themselves sufficiently equiped to discuss institutional issues effectively?	0		
*- Is donor support for capacity development provided through co-ordinated programmes consistent with the partners' sector development strategy? (**Paris indicator 4**)*	2		
*- Are parallel implementation structures such as PIU's avoided (**Paris indicator 6**) and do donors avoid drawing national human resources into their own aid management?*	0		
*- What share of aid and of technical assistance is untied? (**Paris indicator 8**)*	0		
- Which are the key constraints to further harmonisation and aligment as cited by donors, and what is undertaken by donors and government to address this?	1		
Cluster sC2: Are the basic conditions for good governance fulfilled?			
C2-1: Which domestic accountability mechanisms exist? How do they function in support of equitable service delivery?			
- Is the existing regulatory framework supportive of equitable service delivery and development?	0		
- Do sector documents refer to citizen entitlements, human rights and/or ratified international treaties/conventions?	0		
- What is the role of parliament with respect to the sector?	0		
- What is the degree of organisation of civil society in relation to the sector (e.g. user groups, trade unions, professional associations)?	0		
- Are effective political accountability mechanisms in place at different levels of government? Can and do citizens hold sector policy makers or local decision makers to account for bad performance in the sector?	1		
- How would you rate the degree of public access to information about sector policies, budgeted and actually released funds and citizen entitlements to service delivery?	0		
- Which informal or formal mechanisms of client power over service providers exist, including for poor and marginalised groups, and are they used?	0		
- Which accountability mechanisms exist outside government? What is the quality of these mechanisms? E.g, do civil society organisations make good watchdogs?	0		
- Are public or civil society instruments such as Quality of Service Delivery Surveys used to get information about users' perspectives? Is such information used by government to finetune its sector strategy?	0		
sC2-2: What are the main issues hampering good governance?	0		
Which forms of corruption affect the sector?	0		
- What is the impact on service delivery?	0		
How are they addressed?			

- Is an effective anti-corruption strategy in place?	0		
- Can sensitive governance and corruption issues be addressed in the policy dialogue?	0		

Cluster D

	JHSR	Other	Score
Cluster sD: Does the sector achieve the envisaged results?			
sD1-1: Is there a transparent and monitorable performance assessment framework in place to assess progress against the sector programme at different levels?			
Does the sectoral monitoring framework include disaggregated data for gender, age, other categories?	2		
Which stakeholders are involved in the process of monitoring?	0	HSSP II	1
sD1-2:			
What is the actual progress on key indicators with respect to - access?			
- coverage?	2		
- utilisation?	2		
- quality?	1	HSSP II	2
- equity?	1		
sD1-3: How would you interpret progress as captured in the statistics?	2		
sD1-4: If not included in the (quantitative) indicators, how would you rate the quality of service delivery and any equity issues in this respect?	0		
sD1-5 Have any relevant (impact) evaluations been undertaken in the sector?	1		
If so, have the findings been used to revise or finetune the existing strategy?			