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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) has increasingly become the buzz word in the implementation of poverty reduction strategies. Because of the anticipated benefits which are associated to it, M&E has fundamentally become a global phenomenon whereby national and international stakeholders in the development arena have continuously sought for enhanced public governance based on results. With this growth in demand for successful M&E, most prominent development stakeholders such as the donor community and local actors including parliaments, the private sector as well as the broader civil society use M&E information to hold governments accountable (Kusek and Rist, 2004).

The topic of this dissertation is an investigative one; ‘Sector Monitoring and Evaluation Systems in the Context of Poverty Reduction Strategies: A Comparative Case Study of Zambia’s Health and Agriculture Sectors’. To determine the current status and allow for further comparison of the M&E systems of the health and agriculture sectors, it was imperative to conduct a diagnosis for the two systems. Therefore, using the diagnostic checklist elaborated by Holvoet and Inberg (2011), it was possible to draw areas of strength and weakness in the M&E systems of the two sectors. The checklist developed and elaborated to specifically assess sector-level M&E systems is comprised of six (6) criteria namely; (i) policy, (ii) methodology, (iii) organisation: structure and linkages, (iv) capacity, (v) participation of actors outside of government, and (vi) use of M&E information. Results have shown that out of the six assessment criteria, the agriculture sector M&E performs better than the health M&E on four (policy, organisation, capacity and the use of M&E information). The only criterion where the health sector M&E is more developed than that of agriculture is ‘methodology’ while the two sectors scored same for the ‘participation of actors outside of government’ criterion.

In essence, what the assessment results entail is that the agriculture sector M&E system has comparative advantages over the health sector M&E in as far as possessing abilities to supply and create demand for its M&E information is concerned. Thus, a critical analysis of the two systems has indicated that the agriculture sector M&E has better developed ‘supply’ and ‘demand’ sides. On the supply side, the agriculture sector has relatively sufficient institutional arrangements for M&E coordination and oversight at national, provincial and district levels. Comparatively, the agriculture sector also has better capacity for M&E analysis. Other aspects that put the agriculture sector M&E ahead of health is the manner in which M&E outputs are being disseminated through the use of various channels such as agriculture bulletins, extension
services, radio and TV programmes through the National Agriculture and Information Services (NAIS) system.

Similarly, the supremacy of the agriculture sector M&E on the demand side shows that ultimately, it has the ability to create demand for its M&E information than the health sector M&E system. Largely because the agriculture sector has fewer donors and depends on central government funding, the linkages between sector M&E with planning and budgeting processes are stronger than those for the health sector. There seems to be an incentive for the agriculture sector to use M&E information as input in planning and budgeting processes. Although both sectors have poor linkages with the parliament, statistics office, donors and civil society, the agriculture sector tends to generally perform better than the health sector on the same factors.

Generally speaking, there is need for accelerated development and strengthening of sector M&E systems for health and agriculture. Although the agriculture sector compares well against the health sector M&E, there are more gaps that require attention if both sectors were to enjoy the benefits that go with a successfully implemented mechanism. For both sectors, there is need for instance, to step up efforts of ensuring that the roles of the Central Statistical Office, parliament, CSOs and that of the Department of M&E at MOF are well defined and enforced. The weaknesses that exist regarding the rationalization and coordination of donor M&E and sector M&E undermine capacity to have strong supply and demand sides.

The following recommendations are made for M&E improvement in Zambia:

- Sector level

**Conduct thorough sector M&E diagnoses** to identify the weaknesses and strengths of M&E, thereby providing an evidence-based platform to plan for mitigation and improvement. No M&E assessments at sector level seem to have ever been conducted for both health and agriculture.

**Enhance the incentive structure for the use of M&E information** by strengthening and sustaining the supply and demand sides of sector M&E systems. New initiatives are needed and the scope should be made wide to include financial and non financial incentives.

**Engage MOF to provide Sector M&E backstopping** designed to address various weaknesses facing sectors, both technical and political challenges.

**Initiate and strengthen Parliamentary linkages and oversight** in a bid to increase use of sector M&E information to inform policy advocacy and improvement. There is also need to build the currently weak capacity of parliamentarians to interpret M&E outputs.
Create forum for inter-line ministry M&E experience sharing, a platform or national convention where sectors can share best practices and the M&E Department at MOF as the overall coordinator and overseer may convene such initiatives.

- National Level

Strengthen the ‘evaluation’ function in M&E: From the government documents reviewed, ‘evaluation’ is less emphasized than ‘monitoring’. Thus, institutionalizing the evaluation function should be seriously addressed if the learning need was to be enhanced (World Bank, 2009; ADB, 2011).

Guarantee country leadership and ownership of M&E systems through sustained investment in the whole-of-government M&E systems. Without state leadership and ownership, the M&E function would remain ineffective and useless (Leftwich, 2008; Fritz and Menocal, 2007).

Strengthen legislation for M&E: A law that specifically addresses M&E issues is needed for Zambia to begin to take this important development function seriously. Instead of covering up the role of M&E in other existing PFM laws, a separate legislation will go along way for CSOs and citizens to have an interest in holding public office bearers accountable.

- Further Research

Study the Politics of M&E in Zambia and as much as possible doing it in the context of leadership and ownership. In the case of Zambia, there is need to understand how the Politics of M&E were influencing the development of M&E. Some studies need to be commissioned to investigate the factors behind Zambia’s weak M&E at national and sector levels.

Investigate best M&E practices from other countries which Zambia may adopt and adapt: No country is an island. There is need to carry out studies preferably among developing countries and draw lessons which could be of benefit to Zambia.
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1.1. Rationale of Monitoring and Evaluation in Poverty Reduction Strategies

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) has increasingly become part of the necessary requirements for the implementation of development interventions and enhancement of management of public resources. As comprehensively expressed by Morra Imas and Rist (2009:105):

“Throughout the world, governments are attempting to address demands and pressures for improving the lives of their citizens. Internal and external pressures and demands on governments and development organisations are causing them to seek new ways to improve public management. Improvements may include greater accountability and transparency and enhanced effectiveness of interventions. Results-based monitoring and evaluation (M&E) is a management tool to help track progress and demonstrate the impact of development projects, programs, and policies”.

Therefore, many governments of developing countries have in the last decade or so introduced, pursued and implemented policy reforms and programs aimed at strengthening the function of M&E. Put differently, M&E according to Mackay (2007) helps with the identification of what works and what does not work in government projects, programmes as well as policies.

In Zambia, the recent evolution of M&E in government can be generally traced around the beginning of the New Millennium in the year 2000, and particularly towards the end of the 20th Century in 1999. During this period, the World Bank working alongside the International Monetary Fund (IMF) had launched the Poverty Reduction Strategies (PRS) as an alternative or reaction to the controversial Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs) of the 1990s that saw most poor countries plunge into unsustainable external debt (Serra and Stiglitz, 2008).

Zambia developed her Interim Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (I-PRSP 2000-2002) in 2000 and progressively, the first full PRSP (2002-2004) was launched and implemented together with other existing reforms in 2002. Still under the guidance of the World Bank and IMF, Zambia successfully implemented the first PRSP and qualified for external debt relief as prescribed for a country that reached the Heavily Indebted Poor Country (HIPC) Initiative completion point1 in 2004 (GRZ, 2006a).

---

1 To reach HIPC completion point, countries must maintain macroeconomic stability under a PRGF-supported program, carry out key structural and social reforms, and implement a PRS satisfactorily for one year. Debt relief is then provided irrevocably by the country's creditors (see www.worldbank.org)
In addition, some further reforms were made and in 2006, Zambia reverted to ‘National Development Planning (NDP)’. Nonetheless, Zambia’s return to NDPs came after a fairly successful implementation of two Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) which were instruments of poverty reduction prepared under the guidance of the World Bank and the IMF. Thus, NDPs continue to be used as strategies of tackling poverty and are designed to help realize the country’s Vision 2030 (GRZ, 2006c). The Fifth National Development Plan (FNDP) to cover the period 2006 to 2010 was developed and implemented. Currently, Zambia is implementing her Sixth National Development Plan (SNDP) for the period 2011 to 2015.

M&E has been the core component in all the PRSPs and indeed the NDPs. To that extent, all these development strategies and plans have always carried separately elaborated chapters on M&E, outlining the details of how the government was going to holistically tackle the issue of PRS monitoring and evaluation. In this context, M&E is significant not only to the Zambian government, but also to the citizens and other stakeholders. That explains why governments globally are embarking on building M&E systems to enable them measure the quality, quantity and targeting of the various public development interventions implemented. M&E is understood to be an effective instrument towards determination of the extent to which outputs were achieving expected outcomes and impacts (Mackay, 2007).

The figure below depicts how M&E is crucial towards tracking the full process of implementing a national Poverty Reduction Strategy. An M&E system provides evidence based information that becomes important in informing development policy processes such as planning, prioritization, budgeting and expenditures.

---

2 National Development Planning was the mode or strategy of development programs by government but in 1991 with the coming of multi-partism, the new government opted for a free market driven economy. This led to the abandoning of the fourth National Development Plan which was supposed to have run from 1989 to 1994. The NDPs are five year plans and represent the basis for national budgeting and public financial allocations.
Ultimately, figure 1 illustrates how M&E remains an instrument with potential to transform a country’s poverty reduction agenda when implemented properly.
1.2. Sector Monitoring and Evaluation in the Context of Poverty Reduction Strategies

According to Bedi et al. (2006), the strength of whole-of-government M&E systems is dependent on the functionality of individual sector M&E systems. Therefore, to ensure that M&E information is used for internal sector management functions and meets the information needs of stakeholders outside of government, commitment of funds and other resources to strengthening sector M&E systems becomes inevitable. Such investment is thus, better focused on building the sector capacities in terms of human M&E skills and infrastructure. The significance of sector M&E therefore denotes the need for countries, especially the developing ones to prioritize building and strengthening sectoral M&E arrangements in order to be able to track evidence of progress in all public interventions contributing to poverty reduction agendas.

To implement the Zambian National Development Plans (NDPs), sector plans and strategies have been developed and like in the NDPs, M&E arrangements have been elaborated. The M&E systems of the sectors play a fundamental role in information gathering and work as input into the national M&E system that ultimately reflects government’s performance. Moreover, more stakeholders including citizens, donors, Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) and others are usually keen to know where and how the public resources are being utilized with regards to the poverty reduction strategies.

The implementation of the various reforms in Zambia has particularly led to the development and articulation of sector plans in both the health and agriculture sectors. These sector strategy plans have been developed to cover corresponding periods as those of the NDPs. This is to make it easy to implement the PRSs through sectoral plans. For instance, the Ministry of Health (MOH) developed and is now implementing the National Health Strategic Plan (NHSP) covering the period 2011 to 2015 which corresponds with the SNDP’s life span. Similarly, the one earlier was implemented between 2006 and 2010 also corresponding with the FNDP for the period 2006 to 2010 (GRZ, 2010). In the same line, the agriculture sector is currently implementing a strategy plan for the period 2013 to2015. This plan delayed to be implemented due to several organizational changes that were undertaken between 2010 and 2012. However, the one (strategy plan) before was successfully implemented between 2006 and 2010 in correspondence with the FNDP (MAL, 2013).
Essentially, sector plans contain details of resources, activities, programs, and policies of what a given line ministry hopes to achieve during a defined period and exclusive summaries of these strategies are constituted and presented in the various chapters of the NDPs. Thus, both the health and agriculture sectors have elaborated M&E arrangements that derive their principles from a Results Based Management\(^3\). Sector specific information with regards to operations and resource planning, utilization and management is also captured and stored by the sector M&E systems.

The aim of this dissertation is to conduct a research on the M&E arrangements for Zambia’s health and agriculture sector M&E systems using a comparative case study. To be able to achieve this objective and contextualize the sectoral M&E, the paper provides an overview of government-wide M&E arrangements in Zambia. Similarly, to allow for comparisons especially those regarding the functionality and operationalization, the strengths and weaknesses of the two sectors, a critical assessment or diagnosis of the M&E systems of the two sectors will be conducted. To the extent that the strengths or weaknesses of the national M&E depend on sector M&E, this thesis explores and provides analyses in an effort to find out the factors that determine the statuses of sector M&E systems. One of the central goals of this dissertation is to identify and establish areas of improvement towards making poverty reduction interventions effective through sound sector and national M&E systems in Zambia.

The choice to compare the M&E systems for the health and agriculture sectors was done out of curiosity considering the differences between them. In the NDPs, health is categorized under the ‘social services and human development’ section while agriculture falls under the ‘growth’ category. It is mentioned in the NDPs that the National-level M&E system provides overall coordination and oversight of all sector M&E arrangements and offering backstopping exercises to help strengthen and harmonize sector mechanisms. Further, in the context of the changing aid modalities as elaborated under the Paris Declaration on aid effectiveness, the increasing emphasis on bettering M&E systems becomes an inspiration to this study.

Conducting a thorough diagnosis of any M&E system in an effort to understand the overarching problems and thereby devise means to strengthen such a system could be one important

\(^3\) Results Based Management refers to a management strategy focusing on performance and achievement of outputs, outcomes and impacts (see Mackay, 2006: p.142 and UNICEF for evidence-based policymaking at http://www.unicef.org/ceecis/evidence_based_policy_making.pdf).
requirement and first step. In fact, a readiness assessment must be viewed as foundational to the success of M&E systems (Kusek and Rist, 2004). Hence, in assessing the M&E arrangements of the health and agriculture sectors, this paper adopts and adapts the diagnostic checklist elaborated by Holvoet and Inberg (2011) and used in their diagnosis of Niger’s health sector M&E system. This checklist consists of six components that are deemed crucial in determining the status of any given national M&E system and these elements include the following: (i) policy; (ii) indicators, data collection and methodologies; (iii) organisation; (iv) capacity-building; (v) participation of nongovernment actors, and (vi) utility of M&E information (see annex 2).

Notwithstanding the above, it is also prudent to mention that many other scholars and development practitioners have made attempts to elaborate checklists and have raised several issues which they consider to be important when assessing M&E systems. However, most of these checklists focus mainly on technical and methodological issues and much less on organizational, institutional, systemic and political aspects and are largely elaborated specifically for national level M&E and not specific for sectoral systems. Consequently, it is imperative to consider the process of building and sustaining M&E systems as being more politically motivated than technical (Kusek and Rist, 2004; Palumbo, 1987; Leftwich, 2008).

Nevertheless, those articulations could be helpful towards the understanding and appreciation of issues raised within M&E mechanisms. Examples of some elaborated checklists in the literature include the evaluation capacity building diagnostic guide and action framework (Mackay, 1999), the readiness assessment (Kusek and Rist, 2004), the diagnostic instrument articulated by Bedi et al. (2006) and the checklist used by Booth and Lucas (2002) in their diagnosis of PRSPs. Essentially, there is no one single agreed upon checklist regarded as ideal for assessing all matters sounding M&E systems.

However, the Holvoet and Inberg (2011) checklist has been chosen and used for this dissertation because it is comprehensive and ultimately covers the overarching institutional, systemic and political issues concerning sector M&E systems.
1.3. Statement of the problem

Since the end of the 1990s and particularly at the beginning of 2000, Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) became an increasingly emphasized component to be part of the planning and implementation of countries’ poverty reduction strategies. This observation has also been made by Mackay (2006) when he argues that the development community the world over has come to appreciate the important role played by M&E in enhancing the performance of governments. Zambia was among the first countries to articulate and successfully implement her PRSP in 2002 and consequently reached the IMF/World Bank’s HIPC Initiative completion point in 2004 and received forgiveness of her huge external debt\(^4\).

Today, Zambia is implementing her Sixth National Development Plan (SNDP), a national poverty reduction strategy with an elaborated M&E arrangement for implementing, monitoring and evaluating this plan. To reaffirm the country’s commitment to improved public resource management, Zambia is a signatory to the 2005 Paris Declaration (PD) and the Accra Agenda for Action (AAA) of 2008 both of which advocate for strengthened M&E systems at country level.

According to the OECD/DAC (2011b) Monitoring Survey on the implementation of the PD as measured under indicator 11 (Managing for Results\(^5\)), Zambia scored a ‘D’ for its results-oriented frameworks in 2005, improving to a ‘C’ in 2007 and maintained its ‘C’ score in 2011, and this led to a shortfall in reaching the 2010 target of B or A. Despite this failure to reach the PD set target, the trend suggests an evolution to the effect that Zambia had made significant strides over the years towards bettering the M&E at national level. The scores of ‘C’ for 2007 and 2011 could be translated as Zambia being in possession of improved frameworks of M&E across the public sector and by implication, this could mean that Zambia is short but on course in terms of satisfying the PD agreement of having monitorable results frameworks. In addition, the World Bank (2005) in its Comprehensive Development Framework (CDF) Report also notes that Zambia’s monitoring framework was insufficient. After monitoring and measuring the four CDF principles that include the long-term holistic vision; country-led partnership; country ownership; country-led partnership; country ownership;

\(^4\) Upon reaching the HIPC Initiative Completion Point in 2004, Zambia was pardoned of over US$3 billion of her external debt (see [www.imf.org](http://www.imf.org)).

\(^5\) Managing for Results essentially refers to clear definition of expected programme results as well as delivering programme(s) or service(s), measuring and evaluating performance, and making adjustments to improve both efficiency and effectiveness and also it is about functional feedback mechanisms. [http://uneval.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc_id=1205](http://uneval.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc_id=1205)
and results focus, although there were signs of advancement for all, the results focus principle showed the least progress made. This conclusion is crucial for Zambia’s M&E reform agenda.

Further, particular problematic areas identified were around the quality of final reports with lots of analytical gaps and inconsistencies in information flows. Such challenges according to the OECD/DAC (2011a; 2011b), emanated from among others; weak data collection and analysis arrangements used at all levels, and more specifically functional, coordination and linkage gaps between the national level M&E and line ministry M&E systems. This dissertation attempts to study these challenges in details and establish relevant insights about the topic in order to inform both policymaking processes in Zambia and indeed add to the academic literature.

Moreover, the Zambian SNDP is implemented through various sectors of which each owns a separate M&E arrangement. Thus far, although the NDPs elaborate the overall M&E arrangements for the whole PRS country-wide programmes, each line ministry has a detailed explanation through sector strategies on how M&E issues were being institutionally implemented. Nevertheless, the Ministry of Finance (MOF) through the Department of Monitoring and Evaluation is responsible for the coordination of all line ministry M&E systems. In this way, it is crucial to have well functioning M&E arrangements at both the national and sector levels in order to yield expected benefits from such mechanisms. Sector M&E arrangements are mandated with the responsibility of keeping track of all implementation, monitoring and evaluation of line ministry specific strategy plans and ultimately the SNDP.

1.4. Research objectives and questions

1.4.1. Main Objective

The main objective of this dissertation is to assess the sector M&E arrangements in Zambia within the context of poverty reduction strategies using a comparative case study of health and agriculture.

1.4.2. Specific Objectives

- To analyze the institutional arrangements for M&E in Zambia
- To analyze the status of Zambia’s country-level M&E system
- To assess the status of sector M&E systems for Zambia’s health and agriculture
- To compare the health and agriculture sector M&E systems
- To make recommendations for improved M&E systems in Zambia
1.4.3. Research questions

- How is M&E for Zambia’s Poverty Reduction Strategy arranged?
- Why is Zambia’s country-level M&E system weak?
- How do the M&E systems of the health and agriculture sectors compare?
- Why would one sector’s M&E system be stronger than the other?
- What should be done to strengthen Zambia’s M&E systems?

1.5. Methodology and data collection

This dissertation is based on a desk-study research approach. A collection of key policy documents of the Republic of Zambia have been used. Particularly, the national documents and reports on poverty reduction (NDPs, APRs, sector strategies, and management reports) have been collected and reviewed.

Further, the research has also made use of literature from various international development organisations such as the World Bank, OECD/DAC, IMF and other multilateral and bilateral agencies on the subject. In addition, some scholarly journals, articles and research papers equally have been consulted to help with the discussion, analysis and drawing of conclusions and recommendations. Being an employee of the Government of the Republic of Zambia in the Ministry of Finance and working under the Department of National Planning, the author also utilized his experience acquired through participant observation on the performance of Zambia’s PRS M&E.

The literatures above have been accessed from several sources which include; the University of Antwerp Library and the Web of Science online database, other online/internet sources such as the websites of various development organizations. Most of the government documents (mainly from the MOF, MOH and MAL) were obtained from Zambia through personal (email) contacts with government officers in charge of M&E functions. Whenever necessary, the author utilized telephone communication to contact government officers for more information on the topic.

1.6. Case selection

There are a number of factors that led to the choice of this study topic and key among these include the author’s personal interest in the subject of M&E as well as the understanding that

---

6 To have a fair judgement on the sector M&E systems, the study made use of sector policy documents that cover mainly similar periods. Thus, the strategic plans covering the periods 2006-2010 and 2011-2015 for both health and agriculture have been used. Equally, the FDNP and SNDP for the same periods too have been used as key input for the study.
M&E is significant to the development process of developing countries, and particularly to Zambia which is the author’s country of origin. A lot of emphasis and calls for developing countries to build and sustain functional M&E systems as a way of improving performance have been increasing from among the international donor community, civil society, citizens and other local stakeholders.

According to Zambia’s Sixth National Development Plan (SNDP) 2011-2015, sectors are instrumental in the overall process of planning, implementation and most importantly in the monitoring and evaluation of the country’s poverty reduction agenda. This means for all sectors to contribute positively to this mandate, their M&E systems need to be functioning properly. This dissertation therefore is anchored on the conviction that sector M&E is crucial for strengthening national-level M&E and for ultimately achieving the various goals of the poverty reduction objectives and goals.

The poor but slightly improving results and findings of Zambia’s M&E mechanisms in the World Bank Report (2005) carried out under its Comprehensive Development Framework (CDF) and the OECD/DAC (2011) Monitoring Survey on the Implementation of the Paris Declaration (PD) acted as additional motivation for this study. Essentially, Zambia’s country-level M&E arrangements have been defined as weak and can be said to be lacking the capacity to produce information that is useful for both informing management decisions and policymaking at different levels. The results of the OECD/DAC and the World Bank inspired the author to investigate further the status of M&E systems of the health and agriculture sectors.

Since there are many reasons that may influence the building, strengthening and sustaining of a functional M&E system, the selection of the two sectors was done on the basis of their relative differences. Zambia’s SNDP categorizes health under the ‘social services and human development’ sector while agriculture falls under the ‘growth’ sector. In addition, the funding structures of the two sectors also vary to a great extent. For instance, in addition to central government disbursements, the health sector enjoys a lot of donor support compared to the agriculture sector. In fact, there are more donors and development agencies active in the health sector in comparison with the agriculture sector. The agriculture sector mainly depends on

---

7 The OECD/DAC (2011) indicates that Zambia failed to reach its 2010 target of A or B score and instead had a D in 2005, moved to a C in 2006 and maintained a C score in 2007. (see www.oecd.org)
central government disbursements for most of its programmes and activities. Therefore, the author believes that these factors made the two sectors interesting to research on especially in an effort to find better ways of strengthening not only sector M&E but also the national-level M&E which is currently viewed as weak. Moreover, the agriculture sector also has a sufficiently developed private sector whose M&E arrangements could be interesting to know how they coordinate with government M&E systems.

**1.7. Limitations of the study**

Being a desk-based research, this study faced some limitations with regard to accessing complete information pertaining to the actual statuses of Zambia’s M&E arrangements. The total reliance on secondary data sources, particularly government documents may have limited how far the discussion and analysis could go of which a field research would have gathered more time series information to arrive at more concrete conclusions and recommendations. Since government reports are written largely to meet its own interests, the findings of this study could have some biases. There was also limited time and access to consult other important stakeholders such as civil society and donor agencies to get their views on how M&E arrangements were performing in Zambia.

Many attempts have been made to acquire additional information through key informants by way of interviews through Skype but due to poor internet connectivity in Zambia, this method did not work out. The other limitation faced is where the author failed to get independent comments from some government officers using a questionnaire administered via email. The officers attributed their non responses to busy work schedules and instead, kept insisting that government official reports were enough to understand what goes on with M&E.

However, the author managed to access many government reports from MOF, MOH and MAL. Nevertheless, this had to take many efforts to contact government officers from different parts of the country (Zambia) for it was difficult to access all the necessary reports from the various line–ministry head offices in Lusaka. As much as possible, triangulation of government information with other scholarly literature and policy reports written for developing countries in general and Zambia in particular was done. For instance, the insights from the OECD/DAC Survey country chapters on Zambia and the CDF evaluation findings were very useful to contextualize Zambia’s overarching M&E strengths and challenges.
1.8. Structure of the document

The remaining part of this paper is structured in the following chapters: **Chapter Two** looks at the basic concepts, benefits and practices in M&E. Here, the attention is given to the definition of basic concepts in M&E as a way of clarifying the most used and sometimes misused notions in the field of development planning, monitoring and evaluation. The benefits of M&E are also discussed here as argued by various authorities, scholars and development practitioners alike and this aspect is hoped to help the reader to appreciate the immense value that M&E can add to the efforts of poverty reduction for a given government or organization.

The **Third chapter** gives an overview of M&E arrangements in Zambia. The chapter reviews the institutional and operational arrangements of M&E by showing the various actors, structures and information linkages. The other crucial aspect considered here is the usefulness of the Public Financial Management (PFM) to the success of M&E systems, be it at sector of national level. The chapter also gives the overview of Zambia’s M&E status at national level. To do this, the results of the OECD/DAC Monitoring Surveys on the implementation of the Paris Declaration (PD) and those of the evaluations conducted by the World Bank under the Comprehensive Development Framework (CDF) are used.

**Chapters Four and Five** present the diagnoses of the M&E systems of the health and agriculture sectors and analysis of results respectively. The assessment exercises bring out the strengths and weaknesses of each of the sector M&E systems. In discussing and analyzing the diagnostic results, the paper uses the two M&E sides of ‘supply’ and ‘demand’ to demonstrate why there may be variances between the two sector M&E systems.

Finally, the conclusion and recommendations for M&E policy improvements and further research are suggested and elaborated in **Chapter Six**. The recommendations are made specifically for sector level M&E, national level M&E and for future researches.
CHAPTER TWO: M&E - CONCEPTS, BENEFITS AND PRACTICES

2.1. Introduction

This chapter has four parts starting with a general introduction to M&E and the second part is about several definitions related to the notion of M&E. Then the benefits of M&E are presented and the chapter ends by considering a number of notions and common practices in M&E within the context of (PRS).

According to the World Bank (2004:5), “monitoring and evaluation of development activities provides government officials, development managers, and civil society with better means for learning from past experience, improving service delivery, planning and allocating resources, and demonstrating results as part of accountability to key stakeholders”. Hence, due to the increasing demand for actual results of development interventions, M&E information has incrementally been sought for by many stakeholders. It is therefore important to have a better understanding of what M&E involves in order to use its information for various development interventions. Particularly, those responsible for generating and using M&E information are supposed to have a clear understanding of the M&E conceptual meanings and practices within the specific and broader contexts of poverty reduction strategies.

2.2. Definitions

2.2.1. Monitoring

OECD/DAC (2002:28) defines monitoring as a “continuing function that uses systematic collection of data on specified indicators to provide management and the main stakeholders of an ongoing development intervention with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of objectives and progress in the use of allocated funds”.

2.2.2. Evaluation

The ultimate purpose of evaluation according to OECD/DAC (2002) is to assist in measuring and appreciating the relevance and realization of an on-going or completed project, programme or policy. Making use of systematic and objective methods for assessment, evaluation provides
credible information about the pertinence of information designs, implementation and results as well as development performance and sustainability.

2.2.3. Monitoring and Evaluation System

Broadly speaking, an M&E system can be considered as a systematic and effective way of collecting, analyzing and utilizing M&E information to improve poverty reduction interventions that include policies, projects, programmes, processes, and practices. The focus of an M&E system is to track overall intervention progress for the entire results-chain at input, activity, output, outcome and impact levels (Simister, 2009; Bedi et al., 2006).

2.2.4. Performance Indicators

The World Bank (2004:6) refers to performance indicators as “measures of inputs, processes, outputs, outcomes, and impacts for development projects, programs, or strategies. When supported with sound data collection, perhaps involving formal surveys, analysis and reporting, indicators enable managers to track progress, demonstrate results, and take corrective action to improve service delivery”. Thus, sound performance indicators are significant and basic needs for any successful PRS sector and national M&E system.

2.2.5. Accountability

Kusek & Rist (2004) view accountability as conformity and adherence to clearly laid down organisational tenets and practices such as responsibilities, roles and performance with respect to prudence in the management of resources. Development accountability can refer to how public officers use tax payers’ money in government expenditures and how they report progress to the citizens.

2.2.6. Feedback

Feedback entails thorough communication of M&E results and findings back to relevant stakeholders who may use the information to inform their policies, projects, processes and programmes. When properly analyzed, packaged and disseminated; feedback on findings, conclusions and recommendations has the potential to induce organizational learning and improvement (OECD/DAC, 2002; UNDP, 2002; World Bank, 2007a).
2.3. Benefits of Monitoring and Evaluation for Poverty Reduction Strategies

There are basically three benefits that are commonly attributed to M&E my many scholars and development practitioners. All the M&E benefits are closely linked to the development policy cycle and figure two (2) below is an illustration of how information from a successful M&E system may help a government not only to increase performance but reduce poverty as well.

Figure 2: The Policy Cycle: Linking M&E with Policy, Planning, Budgeting and Management

Source: Mackay (2010)

In attempting to express the multifaceted rewards that governments are likely to gain from implementing functional M&E systems, Castro (2009) contends that building and sustaining a good M&E system can be a solid foundation towards good governance because it enhances accountability and transparency of public operations. In the end, M&E has potential to improve the entire public service performance culture thereby help in supporting better policymaking, budget decision-making, and management functions (Schacter, 2000; Dale, 2004)

2.3.1. Improvement of Policy and Planning

The development parameters for countries are normally defined and facilitated by governments through various policies, plans and strategies. In that case, M&E becomes an important
component in helping to inform these processes by providing evidence-based information. In fact, M&E systems can produce valuable information that may feed into development policy, planning and budgeting, organizational learning and ultimately improving the effectiveness of development cooperation (Liverani and Lundgren, 2007; Mackay, 2011). For instance, during the preparation, implementation and review of PRS, M&E information could play an important role towards changing and improving old policies, plans and strategies so that they become more responsive to the specific needs of the poor.

In addition, since most governments are faced with financial constraints, M&E information can be very useful in the process of prioritization and choosing which activities and programmes were cost effective. This means that M&E systems depending on the quality of information produced could play a significant role towards having successful public financial management (PFM) policies in a given country or sector. Mackay (2007) reveals that indeed M&E systems may help to identify the most efficient use of available resources through the information on performance indicators that may signal which activities needed to be prioritized.

2.3.2. Enhancement of Accountability

Most governments, especially those of developing countries are considered by stakeholders to be less committed to transparency and accountability. This is because these governments are usually faced with challenges to produce evidence as to how they implement public programmes towards poverty reduction. The lack of strong M&E systems in developing countries highly contributes to these perceptions. However, strong M&E systems according to Mackay (2007) can help to reinforce efforts towards accountability and transparency in the management of public resources which may lead to positive impact on poverty reduction goals.

But the benefits are not inherent and to make sure that M&E yields these results, governments and organizations need to remain committed to improving the systems. It is for this reason that Zaltsman (2006) asserts that in order for M&E systems to serve as a public accountability and transparency instrument, it is important that dissemination channels such as regular stakeholders’ forums, reports and internet could be used to increase accessibility of M&E information. Similarly, for stakeholders such as CSOs and donors to manage to influence governments to

---

8 M&E has generally come to be considered by the global development community as a powerful tool for gathering and providing evidence-based information crucial in planning and policy-making processes. (see: UNICEF at: [http://www.childinfo.org/files/Country_led_ME_systems.pdf](http://www.childinfo.org/files/CountryLed_ME_systems.pdf)).
demonstrate how public resources are being utilized, Booth and Lucas (2002) note that unless the production and access to M&E information are practically improved, it does not make too much sense to expect enhanced accountability. The only sure way that can lead to sound accountability is to create mechanisms and arrangements that can guarantee the utilization of M&E information by stakeholders and improving the quality and credibility of the information itself (Booth, 2005). The presence and access to M&E information by citizens and other actors can create an opportunity and pressure to build stronger developmental states that will be committed to achieving poverty reduction goals (Fritz and Menocal, 2007; Karl et al., 1999).

2.3.3. Supporting Management Functions

Governments implement their various development interventions mostly through line ministries and agencies. These entities, using their elaborated sector specific strategies and plans implement activities that aim at reducing poverty. However, doing so comes with practical challenges especially on how best to utilize available resources which are normally limited. It becomes important for prudence and prioritization to be exercised by these line ministries but to so this, it requires relevant information on the priorities as well as on the budget provisions. This prompts for functional M&E systems, as Mackay (2007) reaffirms that several governments have hope in functional M&E systems, no wonder a growing number of countries were strengthening their performance systems. So, an M&E system that collects relevant information regarding plans and budget implementation may provide quality management information for line ministries. Zaltsman (2006) observes that in cases where M&E system findings and budget allocations are not integrated it is difficult to make proper linkages between the intended outcomes of agencies and programmes, and the budget classification.

Further, M&E when implemented properly is a tool that can fill the gaps of feedback and learning for government. M&E systems produce information of a wide range which can be applied at different levels of policy, programme, strategy and project. This information is collected, synthesized and packaged to make it usable by different stakeholders within the development structures. To that extent, it is important that M&E information flows are effective vertically and horizontally so that feedback and learning needs can be satisfied. To reiterate the importance of feedback, OECD/DAC (1991) emphasizes that feedback mechanisms which can facilitate direct linkages between evaluation findings and future policy and programme development are crucial for that may be the only way to break away the future from the past
performance failures. Thus, a sound feedback mechanism would provide relevant information which may allow comparisons across development entities and where possible learn from each other.

2.4. Notions and Practices of M&E in Poverty Reduction Strategies

2.4.1. Monitoring versus Evaluation

The two concepts of monitoring and evaluation do not mean the same thing. However, despite their differences, the information collected from the two processes function in complementation. Kusek and Rist (2004:13) state; “evaluation is a complement to monitoring in that when a monitoring system sends signals that the efforts are going off track […] then good evaluative information can help clarify the realities and trends notes with the monitoring system”. In reality, development practitioners usually confuse the two concepts and treat them as meaning the same thing and therefore use them interchangeably. Consequently, for M&E systems to provide useful information to benefit the public sector performance, the functions of ‘monitoring’ and those of ‘evaluation’ could be separated and given budgetary and skills autonomy (UNDP, 2002; Kusek and Rist, 2004). That way, the complementary nature of the processes would yield more benefits than when they were confused to mean the same thing.

Box 1: Complementary Roles of Monitoring and Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Clarifies program objectives</td>
<td>• Analyzes why intended results were or were not achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Links activities and their resources to objectives</td>
<td>• Assesses specific causal contributions of activities to results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Translates objectives into performance indicators and sets targets</td>
<td>• Examines implementation process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Routinely collects data on these indicators, compares actual results with targets</td>
<td>• Explores unintended results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reports progress to managers and alerts them to problems</td>
<td>• Provides lessons, high-lights significant accomplishment or program potential, and offers recommendations for improvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Kusek and Rist (2004)
2.4.2. M&E Demand and Supply Sides

M&E systems are comprised of two aspects, the supply side and the demand side. A successful system therefore will need to have both sides being strong enough and well sustained. Although this may be a challenge for governments which are usually large and diverse, it holds that having such an M&E system can be useful and informative.

On one hand, Bedi et al. (2006) refers to the supply-side of an M&E system generally as a range of systemic and institutional aspects such as data collection, sequencing, leadership, coordination, regulation and oversight. On the other hand, the demand-side is considered to be concerned with the use of M&E information by different stakeholders such as governmental agencies, parliaments, NGOs, CSOs, research institutions, universities, the donor community and the general population. Among others, how these agencies were interacting to stimulate demand for information could be very useful in strengthening the demand-side of an M&E system as well.
3.1. Introduction

The issues in this chapter are presented in four parts beginning, the first and second parts deal with M&E institutional aspects at national, sector and the decentralized structures while part third is a brief explanation of how Zambia’s Public Financial Management (PFM) is linked to M&E. The final part looks at the status of Zambia’s national M&E system using the findings of the OECD/DAC surveys and the World Bank’s CDF evaluations.

M&E is not a completely new phenomenon in Zambia. According to GRZ (2009), M&E has existed in Zambia in many guises since the 1970s but initially it was characterized by stand-alone project based systems, dealing with issues of project implementation. This meant that past National Development Plans (NDPs) were somewhat based on unclear performance indicators and unachievable targets with poor linkages to the budget process. Moreover, such ad hoc arrangements were largely uncoordinated and often supply driven and in many ways failing to meet the demands of the end-users. These gaps become prohibitive to the full benefits of M&E which among them include improved public service delivery resulting from better policies and management.

With the passing of time, several attempts to improve the above challenges were implemented but again these were mainly limited to specific sectors (GRZ, 2009). Some line ministries embarked on developing own sector specific monitoring arrangements and a couple of indicators but all this happened in the total absence of a macro or country-level coordinated framework and guidance. Because of that, those initiatives could not meet the demands for strategic planning and decision making at national-level. Subsequently, in the 1990s, attention shifted to the issue of monitoring impacts, with emphasis being placed on Poverty Monitoring. A number of reforms according to GRZ (2006b) have taken place under the Public Sector Reform Programme (PSRP) aimed at improving efficiency in the Public Sector. This includes improving the setting of well defined priorities, allocation of resources to these priorities, and an interactive process of linking resources to performance targets, facilitating increased transparency and accountability.

The above actions and reforms entails that the Zambian government considers and attaches M&E as an important component in the country’s poverty reduction agenda and especially towards the achievement of sustained economic growth and development. For this reason, M&E has been emphasized and elaborated in all national PRSPs and now the National Development Plans (NDPs). In any case, the ‘championing’ role of the executive arm of government, particularly that of providing clear policy environments is very crucial and foundational to the success of PRS M&E systems (Ronette and Tania, 2010; Kusek and Rist, 2002; Mackay, 2006).

Furthermore, many additional reforms aimed at strengthening the performance of the PFM in Zambia have been developed and implemented since the first PRSP in 2002. Among others, Zambia became the signatory to the 2005 PD and the 2008 AAA and committed itself to implementing the objectives of these international agreements on governance effectiveness. In addition, through the National Decentralization Policy launched in 2002, Zambia reinforced its commitment to developing, strengthening and sustaining a national M&E system that was going to influence policy and better allocation and management of public resources for national development (GRZ, 2006a; 2002; Bossert et al., 2003).

3.2. Institutional Framework for M&E at National level

Following several public management reforms, the Ministry of Finance (MOF) is the one responsible for the overall coordination of national-level M&E arrangements. A separate ‘Department of Monitoring and Evaluation’ whose mandate is to carry out this national responsibility has been established within the MOF and is currently operational. Key functions of the department according to GRZ (2009) include sector monitoring and developing stronger links between ministries and provinces, including focusing on their capacities to monitor the implementation of their programmes. The Department was also created to work with line
ministries and help to also develop their M&E systems as well as Management Information Systems (MIS).

The M&E Department is also expected to report on performance in the NDP, in consultation with those responsible for monitoring and implementation at the sector level. The production of the APR and the Performance Assessment Framework (PAF) which is used as part of the dialogue process around Poverty Reduction Budget Support (PRBS) is equally the role of the M&E Department. The department is also expected to help strengthen the M&E capacity of provinces and districts in areas of data collection, analysis, storage, usage and reporting. Other roles include enhancing budget monitoring and tracking, specifically looking at resources released from budget office in year and tracking these to the level of service delivery.

Figure 3 below represents an institutional framework for implementing, monitoring and evaluating Zambia’s NDPs as elaborated in the SNDP 2011-2015. The linkages as depicted by the arrows indicate envisaged information flows between the various institutional actors.

Figure 3: Institutional Arrangement and Information Flow for NDP Implementation in Zambia

Source: Government of Zambia (GRZ) (2010)
National Assembly (Parliament)
The SNDP recognizes the role of parliament in both the planning and budgeting processes as that of being overseer of the Public Financial Management (PFM). To that extent, Parliament is expected to play a central role in annual budget approvals and through access to annual progress and evaluation reports; it is expected to also closely monitor the implementation of NDPs. As representatives of the electorates, parliamentarians are expected to be NDP overseers (GRZ, 2010).

Office of the Auditor General
According to GRZ, (2010), the Office of the Auditor General (OAG) has the ultimate responsibility of undertaking financial audits and value for money evaluations so as to provide an independent perspective on the utilization of resources allocated to NDPs. Although the OAG focuses mainly on financial audits and evaluations, the findings are crucial for the overall national M&E of the government.

Committee of Permanent Secretaries and Cabinet Office
GRZ (2013) reveals that the committee of Permanent Secretaries has a mandate of making policy recommendations to cabinet and overseeing overall monitoring and evaluation of programs in the NDPs.

Ministry of Finance – Department of Monitoring and Evaluation
As pointed out already, the MOF through the Department of M&E has a mandate to coordinate the implementation, monitoring and evaluation processes of the NDPs and ensure that remedial measures were introduced on programmes that are not on course at sector and national level.

3.3. Institutional Framework for M&E at Sector and Decentralized levels

3.3.1. Sector Monitoring and Evaluation

Sector Advisory Groups
According to GRZ (2009), a Sector Advisory Group (SAG) is a consultative forum, comprising representatives from key stakeholders active in a particular sector. Having been involved in the NDP processes from the formulation stages, it is envisaged SAGs would also have a major role to play in the implementation, monitoring and evaluation stages. The stakeholders involved in
SAGs include Government, Development Partners (DPs), CSOs and representatives of the Private Sector. All SAGs are serviced by M&E sub-committees to give sector M&E on strategic guidance and provide a coordinated M&E perspective.

- Sector Ministries/Institutions

Sector lead ministries undertake M&E activities and these tasks are coordinated and spearheaded by M&E personnel who are also responsible for Management Information Systems (MIS) in their respective ministries or institutions (GRZ, 2009). Thus, every line ministry has a ‘Department of Planning’ whose main responsibility is sector specific planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. It is these departments that are designed to work in linkage with the national M&E at MOF and also to collaborate with other stakeholders.

3.3.2. Provincial Level Monitoring and Evaluation

- Provincial Development Coordinating Committee

The GRZ (2010) points out that Provincial Development Coordinating Committees (PDCCs) are an establishment meant to ensure that M&E findings feed into the provincial planning and budgeting processes. Thus, each PDCC is serviced by an M&E sub-committee to give monitoring and evaluation strategic guidance and provides a coordinated M&E perspective.

- Provincial Administration

All the ten (10) provinces of Zambia according to GRZ (2006a) have Provincial Administrations whose primary responsibility among others is to undertake M&E functions and these are coordinated and spearheaded by M&E personnel who are also responsible for the Management Information Systems (MIS) in the provinces. Operating in conjunction with the PDCC, the Provincial Administration operates as an information bridge between the national and district and indeed the sub-district levels.

3.3.3. District Level Monitoring and Evaluation

- District Development Coordinating Committee

The District Development Coordinating Committee (DDCC) is the lower decentralized structure and plays a key role in ensuring that M&E findings feed into the district planning and budgeting
processes. Each DDCC is serviced by an M&E sub-committee to give monitoring and evaluation strategic guidance and provides a coordinated M&E perspective (GRZ, 2010).

- **District Administration**

Like it is at the provincial level, the District Administration undertakes M&E activities which are designed to be coordinated and spearheaded by M&E personnel who are also responsible for Management Information Systems (MIS) in the districts.

- **Area Development Committees**

At Sub-district level, Area Development Committees (ADCs) have been created through the decentralized policy. According to GRZ (2010), the function of the ADCs is to undertake M&E activities in relation to project implementation in their areas and provide information to the district M&E sub-committee and the communities. Through these lower structures, the citizens of Zambia at community level are expected to channel their input into the PRS agenda for the country and add their voice to the implementation of the NDPs.

### 3.4. Public Financial Management in Zambia

Public Financial Management (PFM) in its broad sense refers to the entirety of government actions and includes revenue mobilisation, allocation, expenditure and accountability of the same public resources (Simson et al., 2011). Therefore, in the context of poverty reduction strategies (PRS), it is significant that the planning and budgeting processes are properly linked to the various M&E arrangements in the management of public resources (Mayne and Zapico-Goni, 1999). Thus, strengthening the PFM system of a country may go a long way in helping to effectively increase economic growth and social development through the realization of short and medium-term goals, plans and the long-term national vision (GRZ, 2010).

The PFM systems make a very important input in successful M&E systems by providing vital financial information on the performance of government. Since the PFM system generates and stores most of the information on public revenues and expenditures, it is therefore crucial for the whole-of-government M&E system to be well linked and coordinated with the PFM system (IDD, 2006; SPA, 2008). Because M&E seeks to track and report on all PRS interventions, a link with PFM becomes inevitable and practically this means harmonizing the planning and budgeting processes is crucial. For that reason, the World Bank (2008) also believes that
planning and budgeting processes holistically need to be linked with M&E mechanisms to allow for performance and accountability tracking. It does not matter therefore, whether it is at the formulation, execution or indeed at reporting stage of planning and budgeting, M&E systems are supposed to be well linked and coordinated.

Indeed, since M&E systems are designed to inform all the different stages of the policy cycle with relevant information, a strong linkage with the PFM system will go a long way in improving government performance and steering stakeholder participation in public resource management (De Renzio and Smith, 2005).

3.5. Status of Zambia’s National Monitoring and Evaluation System

3.5.1. Zambia’s M&E Status based on the OECD/DAC Surveys and CDF Evaluations

Before embarking on the critical assessment of M&E arrangements for the health and agriculture sectors in the next chapter, it is important to give a brief overview concerning the status of the national M&E system in Zambia. The OECD/DAC has conducted three monitoring surveys (2006, 2008 and 2011) on the implementation of the Paris Declaration (PD) principles of alignment, ownership, harmonization, managing for results and mutual accountability. Based on the evaluations of the World Bank’s Comprehensive Development Framework (CDF), the OECD/DAC reports on the progress made by countries regarding the implementation of the Results Orientation principle (OECD/DAC, 2011a; 2009a; 2009b; 2007a; 2007b). According to the World Bank (2003), the four principles measured under the CDF include a long-term, holistic framework; results orientation; country ownership; and country-led partnership. Nevertheless, the findings of interest to this paper are those pertaining to the ‘Managing for Results’ principle.

Three dimensions are taken into account when determining to what extent a country has or has not made progress and these according to OECD/DAC (2011a) include the quality of M&E information generated, stakeholder access to M&E information and coordinated country-level monitoring and evaluation systems. Having a clear understanding of the status of the national M&E system will be a strong basis to study and contextualize sector M&E arrangements. This is so because, essentially, the two levels (national and sector) are supposed to reinforce each other in the specific and broader sense of managing public resources.
M&E is given high priority in the PD as a key success factor. It was imperative according to OECD/DAC (2005) to monitor the progress made by countries with regard to the implementation of the PD. The fundamental need was to evaluate how partner country leaderships were committed to for instance, transforming their results-based mechanisms. Thus, the periodical assessments were significant to the overall success of the PD principles implementation and the monitoring results were planned to inform the stakeholders.

The Managing for Results principle which is measured under indicator 11 of the PD provides significant information concerning M&E statuses of participating countries. Indicator 11 establishes a country’s results-oriented reporting and assessment frameworks that monitor progress against key dimensions of the national and sector development strategies; and that these frameworks should track a manageable number of indicators for which data are cost-effectively available (OECD/DAC, 2005).

Since 2005 when the PD was launched, there are three monitoring surveys that were conducted in 2006, 2008 and the last one in 2011. Zambia participated in all the three surveys and the results, according to OECD/DAC (2011b) indicated that Zambia had some impediments towards meeting all the PD principles accept for the slight progress in the alignment and harmonization indicators. In addition to the challenges regarding improvements on indicators of using common arrangements and aligning aid to priorities set by the country, worse results were recorded for the mutual accountability indicator with limited progress for the managing for results.

In particular, the 2011 OECD/DAC Monitoring Survey found that Zambia failed to reach the 2010 target of B or A score for indicator 11, the Managing for Results. However, there was some improvement. In 2005, Zambia scored a ‘D’ for its results-oriented frameworks, improving to a ‘C’ in 2008 and maintained its ‘C’ score in the 2011 Survey (OECD/DAC, 2011b). The interpretation of the scores implies that Zambia possesses operational M&E arrangements across the public sector. The OECD/DAC Survey (2011b) reported that Zambia has monitorable frameworks that are embedded into the management information systems (MIS), and in various M&E arrangements. With the support of the Central Statistical Office especially in data collection, the line ministries are able to track key information on the performance of

---

9 Indicator 11 for Managing for Results principle is measured on a five-point scoring system ranging from ‘A’ (substantially achieves good practice), ‘B’ (largely developed towards achieving good practice), ‘C’ (action taken towards achieving good practice), ‘D’ (incorporates some elements of good practice) to ‘E’ (little action toward achieving good practice).
government at large. Some important actors in the Zambian M&E function include the Development Partners (DPs), the private sector and CSOs. Further, individual sectors conduct in-depth studies in areas exclusive to their sectors.

Other positive findings of the OECD/DAC Surveys (2008 and 2011) concern the role of other key stakeholders in the public sector. The MOF is responsible for the compilation of APRs which are subsequently submitted to the Cabinet while the other institutions and government departments such as Parliament and the Auditor General are kept informed of the M&E information. Essentially, APRs end up with DPs who need them for aid accountability. To further enhance the smooth flow and sharing of M&E information, the government has built infrastructure to help publish performance results electronically and also in print form. For instance, the implementation of the Integrated Financial Management and Information System (IFMIS)\textsuperscript{10} provides a great opportunity to synthesize and access key national M&E information.

Despite some promising M&E practices thus far, the Zambian government still has problems that require more attention in order to make the whole-of-government M&E system functional. OECD/DAC (2011b) survey reveals that although efforts to resolve problems faced by the Central Statistical Office through the elaboration of the National Strategy for the development of statistics are under way, there are current challenges that undermine statistics management in Zambia. Most of these problems have to do with weaknesses in data collection and analysis as well as timeliness, thereby affecting the efficiencies in reporting. These problems and many others will need to be tackled for Zambia to have credible M&E at both sector and national levels, but this will only be possible with the commitment of government and key stakeholders (Leiderer, 2013).

\textsuperscript{10} The goal of IFMIS is to improve public expenditure management through an integrated and automated financial management system in order to ensure efficient and effective use of public resources. In order to fully implement a system of financial management and commitment control, government officers need sophisticated tools to enable them to keep track of their budget allocations and spending (see: http://www.mofnp.gov.zm).
CHAPTER FOUR: DIAGNOSIS OF SECTOR M&E ARRANGEMENTS

4.1. Introduction

This chapter presents the assessment of the M&E systems for the health and agriculture sectors. It therefore starts with the diagnosis of the health sector M&E system while the second part will be the assessment of the agriculture sector M&E. During the diagnostic exercises, focus will be on the various aspects of sector M&E with particular attention on their strengths and challenges. The chapter endeavors to find out the issues that lead to weaknesses in M&E at sector level so that it will be possible to suggest ways of improvement. In addition, the results of the two diagnoses will be used in chapter five to compare the statuses of the health and agriculture sector M&E systems. The comparative analysis will be important in bringing out practical aspects critical to building and sustaining functional sector M&E systems.

The assessments will be conducted using the diagnostic checklist elaborated by Holvoet and Inberg (2011) which is based on six criteria namely (i) policy, (ii) methodology, (iii) organization, (iv) capacity, (v) participation of actors outside government, and (vi) use of M&E information. Further, although the assessments are qualitative, the diagnosis itself also employs a quantitative method to measure the statuses and uses a five-point system of scoring (LEADS system) which include; little action (1), elements exist (2), action taken (3), largely developed (4) and sustainable (5) (see annexes 2 and 3 – Holvoet and Inberg, 2011; 2012a).

4.2. Assessment of the Health Sector Monitoring and Evaluation System

A number of key documents will be used for assessing the status of the health sector’s M&E system in Zambia. Among these include the two National Health Strategic Plans (NHSPs) covering periods 2006 to 2010 and the one for 2011 to 2015, Health Policy, Fifth National Development Plan (2006 to 2010) and the current Sixth National Development Plan (2011 to 2015). Other policy related documents and reports elaborated for the Zambian health ministry such as the Annual Progress Reports (APRs), reports of the Joint Annual Reviews (JARs) and Sector Advisory Group reports (SAGs) will equally be used.
4.2.1. Policy

There are five aspects to consider when establishing whether or not a sector M&E system is founded on sound M&E policy and how far such a policy is embedded in national and sector strategy processes and plans. The presence of a comprehensive M&E Plan indicating what to evaluate, why, how, and for whom is needed; the acknowledgement of the differences and the relationship between ‘monitoring’ and ‘evaluation’ need to be clearly articulated; and whether autonomy and impartiality which guarantee accountability are recognized in the policy. The other facets include how elaborate the feedback mechanism and the explicitness of integrating M&E results into planning and budgeting are articulated.

Concerning the presence of a comprehensive M&E Plan, the health sector has this aspect well elaborated in sector policies and strategies. The plan to conduct a functional M&E is acknowledged in all health key policy related documents. The HMIS that is comprised of several appropriate systems and procedures is used to monitor and evaluate the implementation of the NHSP (MOH, 2006b). In fact, not only do the NHSPs recognize the importance of M&E function but in all the past PRSPs, the FNDP and indeed the current SNDP, separate chapters on M&E have been elaborated and emphasis stressed that all sectors and government agencies needed to have comprehensive M&E plans.

The notions of ‘monitoring’ and ‘evaluation’ have been clearly differentiated in the policy documents. The two concepts are understood as complementary to each other because the information that is gathered under one process can work as input in the other. In Zambia’s health sector, two evaluations of the NHSP are planned consisting of a mid-term assessment after 2.5 years of implementation and a comprehensive final evaluation at the end of the strategy duration. As for monitoring, it is being conducted routinely with the participation of various implementing structures within the ministry. During these processes, the HMIS, Financial and Administration Management System (FAMS) and other routine systems are used as major tools for data collection (MOH, 2010a).

11 Zambia implemented two PRSPs (I-PRSP: 2000 to 2002 and PRSP: 2002 to 2004) and so far two NDPs since 2006 (FNDP: 2006 to 2010 and SNDP: 2011 to 2015). Each of these poverty reduction strategies contain separate M&E chapters elaborating how the plans were going to be implemented, monitored and evaluated. Since the sector strategies and plans are the ones that carry details, the sector M&E Plans are usually more elaborate on specific issues compared to the NDPs.
Overall, the health sector M&E system provides clear elaboration with regards to reporting, dissemination and integration. The current NHSP shows that the institutional framework for the sector is well defined throughout from the national, provincial, district, health facility down until the community level. Thus, M&E information and reports are planned to flow smoothly vertically and horizontally (MOH, 2010a). Although it seems to be clear on paper about how M&E information is expected to flow, the health sector M&E Plan does not elaborate how this is practically being achieved. For example, to some extent, it is explained how reports move from districts, provinces, sector HQ and to MOF for APR compilation (vertical upward accountability) but it remains unclear how the lower structures receive feedback from the higher levels (vertical downward accountability is vague). Whereas there is an incentive for upward accountability (to meet donors’ information needs), there is negligible demand for M&E feedback downwards, leading to reduced incentives for accountability to the lower structures.

Institutionally, the health sector M&E is linked to the planning and budgeting processes through the Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) and the Sector Wide Approach (SWAp) mechanisms. MOH (2006a) makes an emphasis that the NHSP is closely associated with the FNNDP and the MTEF through which it will be operationalized. In addition, together with a series of annual action plans, budgets and SWAp, the NHSP will be implemented and most importantly the mobilization and utilization of financial resources from the government and donors will be enhanced.

However, despite the positive overall policy articulation of the health sector M&E plan, it lacks clarity on the important M&E principles of ‘autonomy’ and ‘impartiality’. Both the NHSPs and NDPs do not say anything on the independence of the sector M&E. The silence on autonomy and impartiality is opposed to what the OECD/DAC considers to be significant. For the OECD/DAC (1991), M&E conducted in an environment which lacks impartiality and independence of analysis and scrutiny is difficult to accept as being credible because biases in findings, recommendations and conclusions cannot be ascertained.

4.2.2. Methodology

Several elements are used to assess how a sector M&E system is organized with regards to technical and methodological aspects. These include the selection and the quality of indicators, indicator disaggregation, selection criteria used and how the priorities of indicators were arrived
at. Other elements are the elaboration of the causality chain, methodologies used and what data collection sources are used to measure the indicators.

Castro (2009) emphasizes that performance indicators are crucial in helping to understand the progress being made in any development intervention and that they need to be well elaborated throughout the causal-chain or the intervention logic. The NHSPs have clearly articulated and listed the selected performance indicators to measure progress in the sector. It is clarified that the M&E system is designed to monitor and evaluate the entire NHSP of the sector. In that sense, the health sector has identified clear Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). MOH (2006a) indicates that a comprehensive number of performance indicators have been selected and from which a few KPIs are adopted and reported in the NDP APRs.

Further, all the performance indicators are formulated as SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-bound). The indicator matrix of the NHSP shows the baselines and targets for all the selected indicators. MOH (2010a) adds that the health sector and its partners have agreed on a comprehensive set of performance indicators which they collectively use during monitoring and joint reviews. The indicators are designed to collect information at all levels of the results-chain of inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes and impact. These indicators are derived as far as possible from routine monitoring systems and build upon those required for the M&E of the NDP and the MTEF in order to avoid duplication of effort.

Unfortunately the indicator matrix in the NHSP does not show any disaggregation of data among sex, region, socio-economic status, and others. Instead, the matrix gives aggregates only. Not segregating indicator information limits the use of M&E results and findings, thereby inhibiting sound data comparisons and analysis across gender lines as well as regions and socio-economic dynamics. However, efforts to disaggregate data are already in place and according to the MOH (2010a), the revised HMIS was expected to capture indicator information at various levels. The new system called the District Health Information System (DHIS) incorporates a variety of data elements which allow for data segregation and the generation of different reports targeted at different stakeholders. Nonetheless, it is surprising that since the above improvements were done in 2008, no disaggregation of data reflects in the current indicator matrixes reviewed.

There is mention in the 2006 to 2010 NHSP that a consultative approach was followed to select indicators and among these include the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) indicator-
matrix as well as those indicators covered in previous NHSPs. A number of national and international programmes and declarations were also used to guide the selection of indicators. Different local stakeholders such as NGOs, Church affiliated and private health institutions were also consulted in the process (MOH, 2006a).

Accordingly, as far as priority setting of indicators is concerned, the NHSP explicitly expresses the need to streamline the number of measurable set of indicators. The MOH (2006a) reveals that only 14 major areas were considered from which all sector indicators were drawn. Compounded with multiple challenges including high disease burden due to HIV/AIDS epidemic, critical shortages of health personnel, deteriorating health infrastructure, a weak economy and inadequate funding to the health sector, it was significant that the sector M&E focused on a small but effective number of indicators.

Nevertheless, the challenge is with regard to the non-availability of the causality-chain (input-activity-output-outcome-impact) to help in linking up all indicators that are identified at various levels. Despite the presence of indicator lists specified under categories of input, output, outcome and impact, there is no articulation whatsoever concerning the casual linkages between these indicators. The indicator matrix is not organized in a format that allows appreciation of causal-effect linkages and there is a gap in logic which has potential to cause problems of results attribution provided in the sector by various actors. A casual chain is very important for successful implementation, monitoring and evaluation of programmes and policies as well as projects (White, 2009).

However, methodologies and data collection tools for indicator information are fairly elaborated to a reasonable extent. Recognition is there that ‘monitoring’ and ‘evaluation’ indicators have to be specific to capture relevant data. For instance, information from population based surveys (DHS and national censuses) was going to be used to feed into policy and planning processes. In addition, the MOH (2012a) also asserts that monitoring exercises already in place include performance assessment visits to provinces and tertiary hospitals, statutory boards and technical meetings between provincial and HQ.

With regards to data sources, the indicator matrix in the NHSP specifies the sources of information for each indicator. To that extent, the health sector performance indicators are indeed linked to the data sources. The data sources include the HMIS, DHS, MOF, SAG, JARs...
and Mid Term Reviews (MTRs) among others. The matrix is also explicit on the data collection frequencies (monthly, quarterly, and annually) (MOH, 2006a).

Another issue of significance mentioned in the NHSPs concerns the presence of M&E parallel practices in the health sector and this is largely attributed to the complexities in the sector where the information needs of all programmes are sometimes not easy to streamline. This is especially so with donor funded projects as well as those run by private health institutions. Challenges of this nature make the coordination of M&E very difficult for the MOH (MOH, 2010a). These parallel M&E exercises tend to negatively affect the way indicator information is collected and reported. Devising appropriate methodologies aimed at capturing the whole information therefore remains a challenge yet to be addressed.

4.2.3. Organizational structure and linkages

For the sector M&E organisation, two categories are distinguished; ‘structural’ and ‘linkages’. When it is clarified which structure and what linkages are expected to perform specific functions within the M&E arrangement, the flow of information is made easier institutionally (Holvoet et al., 2012).

- Structure

It is important that M&E is well institutionalized so that it is able to provide credible and trustworthy information that attempts as much as possible to satisfy the needs of accountability, feedback and learning. Under organizational structure, the aspects which are crucial to consider include how M&E is being coordinated and overseen; the presence and how active the Joint Sector Reviews (JSRs) are and whether there are functional Sector Working Groups (SWGs) or not. Other important elements to check are the ownership of M&E by the sector and what kind of incentives thereof are in place to stimulate the utilization of M&E information.

Zambia’s health sector has a clearly elaborated institutional framework which provides a good platform for M&E. Through the National Decentralization Policy of 2002, the health sector has structures and representation at national, provincial, district and community levels (GRZ, 2002; Bossert et al., 2003). Collectively, these structures are responsible for the coordination and oversight of M&E matters in the sector. As detailed in the NHSP (2011-2015), MOH (2006a) clarifies that the institutional framework for the health sector include the MOH HQ at national
level; the Provincial Health Offices (PHOs); District Health Offices (DHOs) and health service delivery facilities including Neighborhood Health Committees (NHCs) at community level. Some oversight roles are also enhanced by several advisory bodies created at various levels and these include the Sector Advisory Group (SAG), the Committee of Permanent Secretaries, Provincial Development Coordinating Committees (PDCC), District Development Coordinating Committees (DDCC) and the Area Development Committees (ADCs).

Situated within the MOH HQ, the Department of Planning is responsible for the overall coordination and oversight of M&E functions. In addition to the institutional structure described above, the health sector collaborates with other partners including other government line ministries and departments, Faith-Based health institutions, private sector, civil society, donors, community as well as the traditional and alternative health service providers (MOH, 2010a).

Further, the element about the Joint Sector Review (JSR) is also elaborated in Zambia’s health sector. It is called the Joint Annual Review (JAR). MOH (2012b) asserts that the JAR was first introduced in 2004 to assess the performance of Zambia’s health sector and is meant to complement existing routine M&E systems by providing the opportunity for a harmonized and jointly planned annual assessment process. Their objective is to facilitate collaborative sector policy dialogue and review, with the ultimate aim of optimizing information sharing, transparency and mutual accountability (MOH, 2012b).

However, the MOH (2010b) points out that although the membership to the JAR is ideally supposed to be inclusive of both private and public health providers, the current composition is that members are mostly from within MOH and those affiliated to Churches Health Association of Zambia (CHAZ). This of course reduces the effectiveness of JARs because outside of government actors can help to objectively and critically offer good checks and balances on how MOH performs. With a large share of donor funding in the Zambian health sector, Development Partners (DPs) have become significant players in the development of the health sector. Because of these developments, it has become necessary that there be coordinated planning, implementation and M&E. To that extent, it means that the JARs serve the purpose of addressing the Paris Declaration (PD) principles of harmonization and alignment in a bid to have a unified sector M&E system. Similarly, the PD agenda has also been strengthened by the Sector Wide Approach (SWAp) mechanism which entails pooling both external and internal generated
resources to tackle priority areas in the sector. The health sector has a long history of implementing SWAps through basket funds (GRZ, 2011; Cabral, 2009).

Some of the issues covered during the JARs include the identification of gaps in M&E skills within the context of the HMIS and engaging the Central Statistical Office to jointly address challenges regarding population data interpretation. Leadership and governance, prudence in financial management and the inadequate analysis and use of M&E information are also covered (MOH, 2012b). The methodologies employed which are typically quantitative and qualitative, according to MOH (2010b) help in getting a comprehensive overview of the performance of the health sector.

Regarding sector working groups, the MOH has a relatively active Sector Advisory Group (SAG) in place. As part of its mandate, the SAG is responsible for overall steering of the implementation of the NHSP and monitoring and evaluation of sector performance (MOH, 2013). The SAG meets quarterly to review progress, recommend solutions to identified bottlenecks and build consensus on the overall strategic direction of the NHSP. In addition, the health SAG is also part of the national convention where all SAGs from other line ministries meet to deliberate on various issues affecting the performance of the public sector in general. Some contentious issues such as the DPs wanting to implement parallel M&E arrangements instead of using sector mechanisms are also tabled in the SAG meetings although practical consensus is still a challenge. Donors mostly continue to carry out separate M&E exercises which eventually impact negatively on the strength of sector M&E (GRZ, 2009). In addition, there is also a problem of SAG membership; with many stakeholders still being outside because the criteria used to become members are not clearly explained (MOF, 2008).

Nevertheless, the most challenging factor is the ownership and sustainability of the M&E system by the sector itself. Both the current NHSP and SNDP do not provide full details of the users as well as those stakeholders with potential to use sector M&E information. Whereas the vertical upward accountability (sector to MOF for APR preparation purposes) is clear, there is limited clarification on how both the vertical downward (to districts, health facilities and community) and horizontal (to Church affiliated health institutions, private sector institutions and health NGOs) stakeholders demand and use the information.

12 JARs take the form of selected national-wide assessments of the health sector performance. Field visits, questionnaires, interviews, focus groups, stories and other research methods and employed.
Coupled with the issue of ownership is the element of incentives. Overall, there is a gap in as far as to what incentives are needed to enhance demand and use of M&E information is concerned. Although there is implicit demand for quality M&E results and findings, these efforts are done mainly because of the donor push and support. As the World Bank (2003) notes that many developing countries have signed and committed to creating stringer M&E country systems only to meet donor demands to the neglect of their own systems which have remained weak if not worsening. Further, an M&E champion in the health sector is not necessarily in place and opportunities of improvement lie in the overall government reforms to build better public management mechanisms that shall seek to satisfy stakeholders’ information needs.

- Linkages

To be able to examine the strengths and weaknesses of a sector M&E system, it is important to assess how well linked the system is to the Statistical Office and check whether there exists any support. The other key aspect worth checking includes the linkages that exist between various separate M&E functions at different structural levels within the sector. In this case, assessing the vertical and horizontal linkages can be useful to understand how the system is embedded within the sector’s organizational framework. In addition, the links with the M&E functions of different donor projects in the sector is another significant factor to assess.

The link between the health sector M&E system and the Central Statistics Office is acknowledged in all the NHSPs and the NDPs although in reality it is weak. In the indicator matrixes of both the NHSP and the SNDP, it is stated that the Statistics Office shall conduct national surveys mainly the Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS) and the country Censuses. These surveys usually collect information on outcome and impact level indicators and the results are used by the health sector M&E system (MOH, 2010a). Specifically, the DHS measures indicators such as the under-five and maternal mortalities as well as other wellbeing indicators (MOH, 2012a). As far as this linkage is concerned, it is limited only to using survey data and no other forms of linkages are mentioned. For instance, it is not clear if the Statistics Office helps to build M&E capacity for the sector through backstopping exercises. Further, the annual statistical data collection exercises under the HMIS prepared in form of bulletins by the health sector do not have any input from the Statistical Office as well (MOH, 2011).
Concerning the horizontal linkages, it is mentioned in the sector documents that the MOH collaborates with other line ministries and government departments as well as with various partners such as the private sector, Church-led health institutions (CHAZ) and traditional medical practitioners. In the same line, GRZ (2009) has indicated that the MOH strives to build the collaboration with other sectors through various mechanisms such as the SWAp. Sound inter-sectoral linkages and collaboration are understood as significant for they help to address a lot of bottlenecks that affect the performance of the health sector through divergent feedbacks from stakeholders. Nevertheless, it is not well elaborated in the NHSPs and NDPs how the M&E arrangements between the health sector and those of other alternative partners are integrated. Instead, there is acknowledgement of the challenges in harmonizing and managing the information using unified systems and attempts, according to the MOH (2010a) are being made to work out a practical solution. The health policy is already in place to resolve these challenges but how far in terms of making this a reality is still not clear.

In addition, the vertical integrations are partially elaborated. To some extent, it is clear on the ‘vertical upward’ linkages where the health sector M&E information and reports are demanded say by the MOF for further reporting to the donors. The compilation of APRs by the national M&E system (Department of M&E at MOF) demands for input from the health sector and this is acknowledged (MOH, 2010a).

The ‘vertical downward’ integration is not so strong and for that reason, the ministry recognizes this gap and is therefore making efforts to improve the situation. Particularly, there are arrangements being coordinated through the central sector M&E Unit at MOH HQ to link all levels including Hospital Boards, District Health Offices (DHOs) and Provincial Health Offices (PHOs) (GRZ, 2006a). Nevertheless, although these linkages may be envisaged as functioning properly, the overall flow of information between the different levels is currently characterized with lots of coordination and integration fractures.

Finally through the SWAp mechanism, other projects not directly implemented by the MOH but through partners are also linked to the sector M&E system. Nevertheless, the reports of the JARs have revealed that harmonizing of information needs especially with donor funded projects has been problematic for some years though the SWAp mechanism is useful in strengthening sector M&E (MOH, 2012b; Leiderer, 2013).
4.2.4. Capacity

A diagnosis of existing M&E capacities could be an important exercise in an attempt to understand current gaps and eventually use the assessment results to design practical steps towards improving sector M&E systems. Therefore, the presence of a comprehensive capacity plan needs to be checked and assessed whether there is also acknowledgement of the capacity gap in the plan. Good skills and functional infrastructure can be supportive towards having a strong sector M&E system.

The present M&E capacity of the health sector in Zambia is generally weak. In fact, MOH (2006a) reveals that the shortage of skilled staff throughout the ministry and M&E in particular is considered to be a human resources crisis. The capacity gaps are typically apparent at every level of the organizational structure (central, provincial, district, health facility and community). The Department of Planning which is responsible for M&E in the MOH for instance is usually insufficiently funded by the central government through MOF. The lack of budget independence and autonomy makes things worse for the M&E function in the sector. Actually, the MOH depends on the good will of Developing Partners (DPs) in as far as building M&E capacity for the sector is concerned. This is despite the awareness that in the short run, donor support can indeed help but sustainability is under threat for the long term (MOH, 2010a).

Essentially, the health sector M&E system lacks a comprehensive capacity-building plan. Although acknowledgement of low staff capacity exists, there is no framework in place that explicitly seeks to address the challenge. This may cause negative impact on sustainability and ownership of the sector M&E system.

4.2.5. Participation of non-government actors

The involvement of parliament, civil society and development partners in strengthening sector M&E systems is a crucial factor. It is therefore significant to assess the participation of these stakeholders and the diagnostic results can help to understand the status of sector M&E arrangement. When properly coordinated, the role of these actors can strengthen the demand side of the sector M&E while at the same time put pressure on the supply side to produce credible information. Holvoet and Renard (2007a) emphasize that, a sector M&E system should be able to indicate explicitly how parliaments, civil society, and development partners use and support the strengthening of M&E systems.
Regarding the Zambian Parliament, there is no mention of linkages with the health sector M&E function. In the current NHSP, parliament is not indicated as a key partner of the health sector. Similarly, parliament is neither a member of the health SAG nor the JARs.

As for CSOs, some institutions involved in health service provision are members of both the SAG and also take part in JARs. This is a positive development for the sector, however, it is not clear what specific M&E roles these actors are providing through their membership and participation. The procedures of civil society participation are not well elaborated as to how M&E information is finally being utilized. Although CSOs are members of other development coordinating committees at national (SAGs), provincial (PDCC), and district (DDCC), their particular role in strengthening M&E function is not articulated in the sector strategy plans.

Like is the case with CSOs, the only mention of DPs’ link with sector M&E is through their membership and participation in the SAG meetings and JARs. Thus, to the extent that the primary role of the SAG is to provide overall feedback on the implementation and performance of the health sector, the DPs can be said to be also involved in sector M&E issues. Nevertheless, there is limited information concerning the specific M&E issues discussed by the health SAG. In stressing the need for clear definition of partners’ M&E role in government, Valadez and Bamberger (1994) argue that M&E systems should consider standardizing information needs of donors with those of governments to have uniform M&E procedures. Thus, since the health sector is implementing the PD principles of alignment and harmonization as well as the managing for results, there should be some common understanding among partners on their role in M&E. Although not specified as to what kind of support is given, donors are recognised as being involved in M&E capacity-building efforts in the health sector.

4.2.6. Use of Monitoring and Evaluation outputs

The last aspect to consider when assessing the status of sector level M&E is the utilization of the information generated. Nevertheless, it should be understood that the use of M&E information by various stakeholders may be dependent on a number of factors among them the appropriateness, quality and completeness of the outputs. That is why Bedi et al. (2006) argue that M&E systems that are developed to a level where they are able to produce a wide range of quality outputs for different stakeholders stand a chance to be sustainable. Building M&E systems therefore need to recognize how relevant the system outputs and information are to the
needs of the sector and national policy processes. Essentially, this means designing sector M&E outputs that are appropriate for key stakeholders. In the case of Zambia for instance, sector M&E outputs need to be specific to the MOF, parliament, CSOs, NGOs, partner line ministries, donors and indeed the local-level decision making agencies and structures. As much as possible, M&E outputs are better shared with the general populace as well. On the whole, timeliness of M&E outputs also determines the incorporation, integration and utilization of M&E information at various stages of the policy cycle.

In an attempt to produce quality M&E outputs, Zambia’s health sector has elaborated its health and research strategy in the current NHSP. The strategy aims at contributing to the reliable and credible health sector information (MOH, 2010a). The use of M&E information for the health sector is somehow mixed. Although a lot of data is collected at all levels, there is poor utilization. According to MOH (2010a), the MOH only produces standard reports such as management and annual progress reports meant for high level management and to fulfill donor requirements. Usually these reports do not address the specific information needs of other stakeholders such as the community and other lower structures. At decentralized levels, you normally find data that is not analyzed and packaged into usable reports and formats. To that extent, sector M&E information is only useful to the SAG, the JARs and successively to the MOF and DPs. In addition, it is not clear to what extent the DPs incorporate this information in their decision and policy making processes.

Similarly, the extent to which M&E outputs are used for internal sector purposes is not explained clearly. However, with the presence of the MTEF and SWAp mechanisms in the health sector, one would only assume that the linkage is in existence to some extent. Moreover, it is also not elaborated in absolute certainty how M&E information influences policy-making both internally (MOH) and externally (sector partners, parliament, donors).

Furthermore, there is also very little or no evidence in the NHSPs and NDPs pointing to how M&E outputs are actually incorporated at lower levels to inform day-to-day decision making. So far, it was mentioned in the 2009 APR that the lower structures and other non-state actors may not be incentivized enough to provide the system with quality indicator information simply because feedback may not trickle down to them thereafter. Therefore, the sector may do well for
the sake of sustainability and learning needs to consider innovating new ways of dissemination and reporting of M&E information (GRZ, 2009).

Very little is mentioned as to how the health sector M&E outputs are being used by actors outside of government such as the CSOs, NGOs and the DPs. However, there is reference to some donors cutting financial support to the Zambian health sector between 2007 and 2009 when huge amounts of funds were reported to have been misapplied (MOH, 2010a). Moreover, it could have been appropriate for the current NHSP, SNDP and APRs to explicitly mention whether the information about the fraud was identified through sector M&E or through an external audit exercise.

4.3. Assessment of the Agriculture Sector Monitoring and Evaluation System

Like it was the case when assessing the health sector M&E system, this part of the study gives a diagnosis of the M&E system for the agriculture sector drawing information from a number of key Republic of Zambia policy documents. These include the National Development Plans (NDPs), the Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs), and the National Annual Progress Reports (APRs). In addition, sector specific sources including the Agriculture Management Information System (MIS) Manual, National Agriculture Policy, the immediate past Agriculture Strategic Plan (2006-2010) and the current Strategic Plan (2013-2016) are also used. Other policy and scholarly sources will too be consulted.

4.3.1. Policy

On the whole, Zambia’s Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (MAL) recognizes the significant role of M&E and makes an emphasis that when successfully operationalized, M&E offers the most desired information that can be used to enhance the sector’s performance. It is contended that through a well implemented M&E system, the agriculture sector may positively contribute to the realization of poverty reduction goals and improve citizens’ well-being (MAL, 2013). Even in the 2008 APR, it was recommended according to the GRZ (2008a) that the MAL needed to develop an effective and reliable M&E system in order to get information that was going to enhance sector performance.

The MAL (2013) explains that all sector strategic plans were designed to be operationalized through stronger M&E arrangements at all levels. Linkages of sector M&E framework to other
management functions has also been clarified so that information from M&E is used for accountability, decision making and policy advocacy and improvement. There is notable acknowledgement as well of how and to whom M&E results and findings were meant to help, stressing that policymakers and day-to-day management decision-makers within and outside the sector made the primary users.

The notions of ‘monitoring’ and that of ‘evaluation’ are differentiated to some extent. In the MAL Strategic Plan (2013-2016), it is specified that monitoring exercises will be conducted using results frameworks, work plans, field visits, joint annual reviews, quarterly and annual reports in a continuous process throughout the implementation of the sector plan. Also for evaluation, a mid-term internal evaluation and a final external evaluation at the end of the implementation of the Strategic Plan shall be conducted. Mention is also made that the purpose of carrying out M&E was to promote informed and results-based management at all levels of the sector. That is why for instance, monitoring results as well as the mid-term internal evaluation findings shall be used as key input into the final external evaluation process (MAL, 2013).

Even when the autonomy and impartiality of the M&E system is an important element towards building a strengthened sector MIS, there is no mention or acknowledgement of this need throughout the policy documents.

Regarding the reporting and feedback mechanisms, there are clear elaborations of how these are being done. Both the sector strategies and MIS Manual make mention of the important components of reporting, dissemination and integration of M&E information. The Agriculture MIS Manual acknowledges that feedback is crucial and steps have been taken to identify and map-out specific information needs and forms of dissemination for every department in the sector. MAL (2002) stipulates that each department shall produce a prioritized number of information outputs such as management reports to be produced on monthly, quarterly, and annual basis. These reports are planned to be generated at every level of the sector.

In addition, dissemination channels are also specified for different departments, for instance, through the use of Crop Forecasting Survey reports and Agricultural Statistical Bulletins. The MAL has a successful information dissemination arrangement which is institutionalized and this is the National Agricultural Information Services (NAIS). With its presence at national, provincial and district levels, the main responsibility of NAIS is to disseminate agricultural
related information throughout the country by use of radio and television programmes. The programmes are presented in both English (official language) and several vernacular languages to reach out to all the intended audience. Popular TV and radio programmes include the ‘Rural Notebook’ and ‘Farm Magazine’ which are broadcasted throughout the week on daily basis. However, there are still challenges regarding equipment to gather information from across the country (MAL, 2006).

Further, the information storage systems are equally specified to be both hard and electronic copies. But since there is a poor internet system in government entities generally, there is limited use of this as a medium of dissemination especially as most stakeholders (farmers) are located in under serviced remote places. However, there is acknowledgement by the government (MAL) to expand internet technology to the country sides to enhance free information exchange.

The aspect of alignment of M&E to planning and budgeting is also well elaborated in the MAL Strategic Plans. Shortcomings and limitations concerning the general welfare of the agriculture sector M&E and acknowledged. Some notable challenges according to MAL (2013) include limited M&E products like policy briefs and reports whose information could be helpful for policy formulation, planning and resource distribution.

The agriculture sector largely depends on the allocations and disbursements from central government through the MOF. The sector has a Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in place, a mechanism that attempts to link and harmonize plans and budgets (World Bank, 2013). To that extent, the MAL (2013) reveals that an MTEF is being used to operationalize the MAL Strategic Plan by linking the sector strategies and work plans to the annual budgets. Specifically, the sector uses an activity-based approach to budgeting whereby every year the ministry prepares budget framework papers which represents objectives, activities and outputs. In all these exercises, M&E information is expected to be used as a basis to justify intervention priorities. Consequently, the MOF is said to be involved by providing a critical assessment as to whether the agriculture sector priorities are always in conformity with those reflected in the NDPs through the MTEF.
4.3.2. Methodology

Essentially, this part considers how the indicators in the agriculture sector have been elaborated and how the M&E system is managing the information collected. The sector Strategic Plans and MIS Manual have elaborated the indicators and explained the importance of measuring them as a basis for strengthening the performance and sustaining the already gained good practices. The MAL (2006:52) asserts that, “the programmes and activities will be monitored based on the indicators developed. Other main monitoring indicators and instruments can be developed or refined as the programme is implemented”. For each of the several departments, the agriculture sector has in place clearly defined set of indicators which are harmonized with those in the NDPs. The indicator lists in the matrixes of the sector plans and those in the SNDP are harmonized.

The quality of indicators is considered as an important issue for the agriculture sector and an effort has been made to formulate them in a SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-bound) manner. There is mention in the MIS Manual that when formulating and selecting the indicators, they were compared and aligned to meet international standards. To that extent, one would ascertain the fair quality of the agriculture sector indicators in Zambia. All the KPIs for the sector in the SNDP have clear baselines and targets. Mention has however been made in the Strategic Plans that setting baselines has always been a challenge due to limited and usually scattered information concerning most indicators (MAL, 2013).

Unfortunately, there is neither mention nor evidence in the documents (Strategic Plans, MIS Manual, APRs) of the need for disaggregation of data in the sector indicators. Being a sector that has huge variances between the participation of people on gender, region as well as socio-economic status, one would expect an effort to measure the differences. Moreover, the MAL (2006) reveals that more than 80 percent of rural dwellers in Zambia are involved in agriculture and women and children formed the majority. Agricultural activities make the largest safety net for food security and income generation for most people in Zambia.

Further, not so much is highlighted on the process of indicator selection in the sector. There is mention of consulting international standards on best indicator selection but less is given regarding local stakeholder consultations and engagements. Given the nature of the sector, one
would expect that farmer groups, co-operatives and research institutions (public and private) would be among those involved to determine the indicators to be measured.

As regards indicator prioritization, both the Agriculture Strategic Plan (2013-2016) and MIS Manual acknowledge the fact that the sector is too broad and designing effective indicators is not an easy undertaking. This concern was emphasized in the 2008 APR when it was identified that a small and relatively easy to measure number of indicators needed to be generated. Particularly, the effort was to adopt more appropriate indicators for reporting on the sector performance and impact (GRZ, 2008a). The sector is comprised of complex activities and especially that most programs are far away in remote places, selecting and measuring agriculture indicators could be problematic. Consequently, the MAL (2013) recognizes the necessity of having in place a relatively small and manageable number of indicators and that coupled with the understaffing in the sector, a large number of indicators undermines the effective collection and measuring of indicators.

Nevertheless, there is a challenge with the causality-chain. The agriculture sector indicator matrix does not provide a coherent results chain to elaborate how indicators at various levels (input, activity, output, outcome and impact) were linked to each other. Such a program theory, according to Rossi et al. (2004) helps to clarify the relationships between the lower and upper level indicators and this can make it easy to appreciate how the impacts of development interventions come about. Thus, the core purposes of M&E that include management, accountability, feedback and learning stand a high chance of being enhanced when the causality chain is clarified (Pritchett et al., 2012; White, 2009). In fact, program theories are inevitable for successful development interventions and especially when trying to measure the impact and relevance of programmes, policies and projects. If causality chains for interventions are not well elaborated or not in place all together, evaluation experts advise that it is better to reconstruct them (Leeuw, 2003; Astbury and Leeuw, 2010).

Furthermore, one other aspect which is well articulated in the agriculture sector concerns the methodologies of indicator-data collection. MAL (2002) highlights that for every department in the MAL, relevant indicators have been identified together with key data sources and data collection tools. For example, to capture some data, the sector M&E uses Crop Forecasting Survey (CFS) Questionnaires, Post Harvest Survey (PHS) Questionnaires as well as Crop/Input
data collection sheets. A variety of data sources are also stipulated such as reports from farmer groups, Ministry of Commerce, Trade and Industry, Meteorological Department, Central Statistical Office, Food Reserve Agency (FRA) and the Zambia National Farmers’ Union (ZNFU). Other sources include the Crop Forecast reports, National Food and Nutrition Commission (NFNC), Zambia Bureau of Standards and the Export Board of Zambia (EBZ) among others.

However, how far these methodologies and data sources are mutually integrated is not clear from the reports reviewed. Nevertheless, there is an attempt to link some indicators to the identified sources of data collection through the indicator matrix provided in the Strategic Plan (2013-2016). But, there is no mention or acknowledgement made concerning the need to use different methods (quantitative and/or qualitative) to gather M&E information. The triangulation of data collection methods is important to increase reliability and credibility of results especially in the presence of various in the sector/country (Bamberger et al., 2010).

### 4.3.3. Organisational structure and linkages

- **Structure**

In line with the question on whether or not the agriculture sector has an appropriate institutional structure for coordination, support, oversight, analysis of data and feedback, the Agriculture Strategic Plan (2013-2016) gives a good overall impression. M&E is explicitly acknowledged as phenomenally crucial for the success of the sector’s programmes by creating an opportunity to analyze the implementation of the strategy. It is also recognized that doing so requires a clearly elaborated and functional organizational structure in place.

The Policy and Planning Department (PPD) located at the ministry head office (HQ) is the one mandated to carry out the M&E function. The department’s principal roles according to MAL (2013) among others include the provision of overall sector planning, monitoring and evaluation of the strategic plans and all forms of oversight and coordination including those M&E activities involving budgeting and donors. In addition, the overall national level structure for implementing, monitoring and evaluating the agriculture sector programs as planned in the Strategic Plans is coordinated within the broader context of the National Decentralization Policy and PRS.
On the aspect of Joint Sector Reviews, it is mentioned in the current MAL Strategic Plan that Joint Annual Reviews (JARs) were going to be used as part of M&E exercises and provide feedback on the performance of the sector. However, there is no comment regarding the current operational status of the JARs. Although on paper JARs are considered to be tools for M&E, there is no evidence about their (JARs) activities in the sector documents reviewed (Strategic Plans, NDPs, MIS Manual, and APRs).

The agriculture sector however has a Sector Working Group called the Sector Advisory Group (SAG) whose overall function is to provide implementation, monitoring and evaluation feedback on the performance of the sector through recommendations and suggestions. Typically, the SAG thrives to ensure that priority programmes were implemented and performance issues against the KPIs are addressed satisfactorily. Although the background pertaining to how active the agriculture SAG has been in the earlier year is reportedly poor, there has been some improvements over the last few years. According to GRZ (2009), the SAG met as planned, once every three months and reviewed a number of performance challenges. These meetings for example led to the review and revision of the PAF and some KPIs.

Although the SAG is active, the quality of both systemic and substance issues discussed during the meetings have been questioned by some stakeholders (MOF, 2008). For instance, the 2009 Mid-Term Review (MTR) found that the quality of contents concerning most meetings for SAGs fell short of the expected standards especially with regards to the aspects of budgets and information on KPIs (GRZ, 2009).

Further, the issues concerning the ownership of the M&E function particularly with regards to the demand of M&E is fairly articulated in the Agriculture Strategic Plan (2013-2016). There are three priority objectives in the strategy that are aimed at strengthening M&E and general information status of the sector. To that extent, the MAL is committed to improve M&E through the provision of appropriate policies, legal framework and to effectively plan, monitor and evaluate the implementation of sector policies and programmes in order to assess their contribution to set objectives (MAL, 2013).

With regards to the use of incentives to stimulate data collection and utilization, there is weak evidence of such practices and arrangements in the sector. Particularly, what is mentioned is the availability of plans to strengthen the links of using M&E information in processes such as the
MTEF, policy and decision-making. To that effect, GRZ (2010) appeals to all sectors to formulate strong initiatives that ensure the use of evidence when developing MTEFs and when performing other PFM functions.

- Linkages

The agriculture sector M&E system is connected to a number of structures and stakeholders who share different forms of information. The Central Statistical Office, the MOF M&E Department, Development Partners (DPs), NGOs, the provinces and district sector offices are among the actors who collaborate with the sector M&E system.

It is good to note that the linkages between the agriculture sector M&E and the Central Statistics Office are recognized and appreciated in the sector. The Statistics Office is acknowledged as being among the primary sources of agricultural information and directly feeds into the M&E system of the sector. Through national and selected sector surveys, the Statistics Office generates data that is used by the agriculture M&E system (MAL, 2013). However, there is no mention of how the sector M&E collaborates with the Statistics Office outside of the survey data. To that extent, there is limited elaboration as regards to the full role of the Statistics Office in working with the M&E within the ministry of agriculture. One would hope to find M&E backstopping activities such data collection, analysis, interpretation, storage and use being highlighted. The role of the Statistics Office needed to be broader than limiting it to the few surveys.

Horizontal integration between the sector M&E and other sub-sectors and semi-governmental institutions is developed and functional to some extent. The MAL has several departments (agribusiness and marketing, policy and planning, agriculture, co-operatives development, fisheries, veterinary services and livestock development), each focused on a relatively different mandate. There are also stakeholders like the Food Reserve Agency (FRA), Zambia Bureau of Standards (ZBS), Meteorological Department, NGOs, private sector, DPs and others who continuously have linkages with the agriculture sector. The MIS Manual and Strategic Plans acknowledge these divergent M&E information needs and attempt to elaborate how integration could be attained. At every level, there is an information office or point persons in charge of compiling and reporting agriculture information and these are used as integration points (MAL, 2002).
For the two kinds of vertical integration (upward and downward), the results are mixed for the agriculture sector. The terms of reference (TOR) drawn and specified for the development of the M&E section of the current Strategic Plan strongly recommended that the national M&E located at MOF needed to function in constant collaboration with the M&E system for the agriculture sector. It is further explained that the two M&E levels (sector and central) needed so share information and as much as possible backstopping exercises needed to be planned in order to help strengthen the sector M&E (MAL, 2012). There is however, unclear practical evidence of what linkages are currently in place for the vertical upward linkages.

Nevertheless, there is hope for the ‘vertical downward integration’. Although not fully operational, there is evidence of information linkages between the sector M&E at central sector level and the lower structures at provincial and district levels. Since there are M&E units at these levels, basic information concerning the operations of the sector is available. The challenge however remains with the analytical quality gaps and lack of space to debate tough accountability issues. The APRs have raised this concern across consecutive years (2008, 2009, 2010 and 2011).

With regard to efforts of coordinating DPs’ M&E mechanisms for projects and vertical funds in the sector, there is limited mention about this aspect. This could be due to the limited number of donors in the agriculture sector. Nevertheless, there is mention that information concerns for all donors were being addressed within the sector structures (MAL, 2006). But again, how far this was being achieved practically remains unclear.

4.3.4. Capacity

In the agriculture sector Strategic Plans and MIS Manual, the issue of M&E capacity is addressed. There is recognition that M&E capacities are necessary for the sector to be able to generate credible information that could be considered useful for improving both policy and decisions in government as well as other stakeholders’ performances. Nevertheless, the M&E capacity for the agriculture sector is still weak with lots of gaps in skills, infrastructure and general coordination. Actually to some extent, “the MAL has a fragmented M&E system coupled with a lack of capacity to collect, analyze and interpret data from the field” (MAL, 2013:17).
In an apparent strife to resolve the human capacity challenge faced by the agriculture sector, the MAL (2013) reveals that the Ministry was going to support the existing staff by facilitating their training in M&E skills and assign them with M&E functions in addition to their core responsibilities while creating a more permanent structure across all the levels of the sector.

However, one of the undermining problems in the sector currently is low staff motivation due to very poor working conditions. The Agriculture Strategic Plan (2006-2010) indicated that the poor conditions of service mainly in form of salaries have resulted in the de-motivation of staff who no longer fully applied themselves to their work. There is acknowledgement that the sector needed to implement an incentive scheme that sought to encourage and motivate officers to perform to their full potential. However, the current poor M&E capacity is compounded by the scarce financial resources for the agriculture sector in general and M&E activities in particular (MAL, 2006; GRZ, 2008b).

4.3.5. Participation of non-government actors

For sector M&E to be strong, the active participation of various stakeholders outside government is crucial. Particularly why and how the parliament, civil society and development partners are involved in the M&E activities of the agriculture sector are significant aspects to assess when attempting to understand the status of a system.

The role of Parliament in the agriculture sector M&E is not mentioned in all the reviewed documents (Strategic Plans, MIS Manual, APRs, and others). However, the only linkage acknowledged is through the unstructured and irregular parliamentary debates and question and answer sessions normally presented by the MAL Minister. These linkages are however too general in nature and do not categorically address M&E issues. There is no other institutionalized arrangement in place, be it Joint Annual Reviews (JARs) or Sector Advisory Group (SAG).

As for the civil society, the only linkage mentioned is through the SAG. But as indicated already, there is limited evidence regarding the current activeness of the SAG and by implication this might mean that CSOs’ participation in strengthening the agriculture sector M&E is not fully incorporated. Along the same line, the M&E role of donors is also not clarified and is limited only to their membership to the less active SAG. The role of DPs is only acknowledged but the
procedures regarding their participation in the SAG are not elaborated. Most NGOs for instance have ad hoc links with the agriculture sector M&E system.

4.3.6. *Use of Monitoring and Evaluation outputs*

Bedi et al. (2006) emphasizes that before disseminating M&E outputs to stakeholders, there is need to ensure that the analytical quality of the information is good and relevant. Further, to increase the use of M&E outputs, a wide range of products targeted at different audiences is imperative for success. Notwithstanding, a dissemination strategy equally requires to be effective and flexible enough to make sure products reach out to both government as well as the actors outside of government. The utilization of M&E system results and findings by different stakeholders is a significant success factor. In fact, the usefulness of M&E systems can be anchored on the relevance and usefulness of the products in informing management decisions as well as policymaking processes. Therefore, the M&E reports and various outputs are important because they carry M&E information.

Although there is mention of various reports which the agriculture sector M&E produces, it is done in a rather generalized manner without specifically and coherently linking them to structural levels and stakeholders. The indicator matrix of the Strategic Plan (2013-2016) shows that several sector reports were going to be generated by the M&E section and disseminated to various stakeholders working with the sector. Not much detail is given on what kinds of reports are produced except mentioning that they were management reports (monthly, quarterly, semi-annual and annual) (MAL, 2013).

For the donors, it is not clearly explained how they use the sector M&E outputs. In any case, what is mentioned in the sector’s Strategic Plan (2013-2016) is only about APRs which are shared through the MOF to DPs. It is however not clear how they further make use of these outputs especially to influence their own management decisions as well as aid related policies.

However, mention is made in the Strategic Plans and MIS Manual that the MAL uses the M&E outputs for management decisions. The MAL (2013) asserts that sector M&E information was going to continue to be used to inform decisions to improve the implementation of the Strategic Plan and as much as possible also used to advocate for policy shifts in order to bring about an effective agriculture sector. To that extent however, no specific evidence was found on how the actual implementation was being done.
CHAPTER FIVE: ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF M&E DIAGNOSTIC RESULTS

5.1. Introduction

This chapter has three parts. It first presents a summative overview of the diagnostic results for the health and agriculture sectors. Based on the assessment findings, the second and third parts provide an analysis of some issues arising and are discussed under the broad scopes of the ‘supply side’ and ‘demand side’ of M&E systems. The assessment results have shown that the agriculture sector M&E system is better performing compared to that of the health sector. Thus, the analysis is focused on highlighting some of the underlying reasons as to why the M&E system of the agriculture sector is comparatively successful. Recommendations for better sector M&E development and strengthening will be drawn from the discussions.

5.2. General Overview of the Findings

The table below is the quantitative presentation of a summary of results from the diagnosis of the M&E Systems of the health and agriculture sectors in Zambia. Details of the assessment results for each of the sectors are presented as annex one (1) but for broad comparisons, this table provides aggregated score results for both sectors.

Table 1: Quality Assessment Scores for Zambia’s Health and Agriculture M&E Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>HEALTH SECTOR SCORE</th>
<th>AGRICULTURE SECTOR SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Policy</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Methodology</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Organization: structure</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Capacity</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Participation of Actors outside Government</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Use of M&amp;E outputs</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: M&E Assessment Results compiled by the author

From the table, it is shown that out of the six (6) criteria used for the assessment exercise, the agriculture sector compares better on four (4) criteria (policy, organisation, capacity and the use of M&E outputs). A further result of interest perhaps is that only on one criterion (methodology) the health sector M&E system is scoring comparatively better than that of the agriculture sector.
For the criterion on ‘participation of actors outside of government’, the two sectors have the same score (1.7).

Nevertheless, it can be noted from the results that despite this general trend of the agriculture sector M&E being comparatively better developed, there are further specific dynamics within the scores between the two sectors and doing a further analysis of the underlying reasons behind could be helpful (see diagnostic details in annex 1). The section that follows tries to provide a critical focus and analysis on most of the observations and issues that could help to explain the diagnostic results presented above and especially why the agriculture sector M&E is reportedly to be relatively better performing than that of the health sector. Therefore, the issues for discussion are covered under the two broad but important thematic questions: i). Why is the ‘supply side’ of the agriculture sector M&E system more developed than that of the health sector? ii). Why is the ‘demand side’ of the agriculture sector M&E system better than that of the health sector? The reasons that put the agriculture sector M&E ahead of the health sector M&E will be brought out and ways of improving both systems will equally be explored.

According to Bedi et al. (2006), a PRS M&E system can be viewed as an equation with two sides; on one end is the ‘supply side’ while on the other is the ‘demand side’. Therefore, in order for countries and/or sectors to build and strengthen their M&E systems and improve performance towards poverty reduction, it is crucial to invest and ensure that both the supply and demand sides of their M&E equation are effective.

The supply-side generally refers to the range of systemic and institutional aspects such as data collection, sequencing, leadership, coordination, regulation and oversight. As for the demand-side, it is concerned with the use of M&E information by different actors that include governmental agencies, parliaments, NGOs, CSOs, research institutions, universities, the donor community and the general population. How these entities interact to stimulate demand for information could be very useful in strengthening the supply and demand sides of an M&E system (Bedi et al., 2006).

Nevertheless, it must be understood that the capacity of a sector M&E system to supply and create demand for credible and quality information can be a complex undertaking. According to Schiavo-Campo (2005), governments need to be very clear on what exactly is meant by ‘capacity’ whenever they plan to strengthen M&E to improve their performance. The reality is
that capacity-building in general and M&E in particular goes beyond that common understanding of providing staff with a series of trainings in M&E. Instead, successful M&E capacity-building interventions with potential to induce the supply and demand sides are those that cover institutional, organizational, information and technology as well as human capacities. Moreover, this is the focus of the next section, to try as much as possible to highlight the strengths that make the agriculture sector M&E comparatively more capable than that of the health sector.

5.3. M&E Supply Side – Capacity to Supply Useful Information

Why does the agriculture sector M&E exhibit more ability to supply information than the health sector? Indeed, the M&E diagnostic results are prompting for a thorough investigation into this question. GRZ (2009; 2002) and Bossert et al. (2003) reveals that M&E is not a completely new phenomenon in the management of public resources in Zambia. Individual projects and programmes, largely those supported by donors had for a long time been implementing isolated and usually different forms of M&E. From as early as the 1970s, Zambia experienced such fragmented M&E arrangements in sectors like agriculture, education, health and water and sanitation but at the beginning of the year 2000, efforts to unify M&E at national level through the PRSP approach began. M&E fragmentations can lead to many performance problems that include duplication and redundancies in data collection, gaps or imbalances in monitoring, lack of data compatibility and poor information flows among others (Bedi et al., 2006). Hence, organizing a functional supply side of a PRS M&E system can be both complex and complicated largely because of the existing and potentially fragmented M&E arrangements.

What follows are some supply-side aspects which are considered to be critical to the success of a sector M&E system. Through these aspects, the paper attempts to make it easy to bring out the fundamental reasons that explain the success of the agriculture sector M&E as portrayed by the diagnostic results. Effort is also made to show why the health sector M&E needs more improvements in order to develop the ability to supply information needed by most of its stakeholders.

5.3.1. Coordination and Oversight

There is need to continue keeping in mind that sector M&E is not only a complex undertaking but also multidisciplinary and to be successful in building and sustaining systems of M&E, the need for an intensive investment in skills and infrastructure becomes inevitable. Thus, dealing
with and engaging both the internal and external stakeholders to sector M&E require a unique but appropriate combination of knowledge and capacity (Ronette and Tania, 2010).

For sector M&E systems to be able to function successfully, the role of coordination and oversight is significant. Bringing together divergent stakeholder interests and differences like in the case of Zambia’s decentralized set up expresses some challenges to having well functioning M&E systems (GRZ, 2002; Ronette and Tania, 2010). Thus, coordination and oversight may require to be implemented in such a way that a wide stakeholder consultation (including CSOs, NGOs, private firms, donors, etc) is incorporated where various M&E issues could be discussed and agreed upon. As Bedi et al. (2006) have contended that the role of coordination demand for the rationalization of existing M&E activities in order to resolve all the needs and concerns of the actors involved. Failure to have consensus on the fundamentals around oversight and coordination may motivate stakeholders to maintain their autonomy and protect their separate and parallel M&E activities. Essentially, coordination and oversight issues are supply side and are undertaken by the sector M&E implementation structures.

The results of the diagnosis have shown that the coordination and oversight roles are better for the agriculture sector M&E (score of 3) compared to those under the health sector (score of 2). Overall, although the agriculture sector M&E still needs improvement, there are currently appropriate institutional and structural arrangements for coordination, support, oversight, analysis of data and for feedback. For instance, there is acknowledgement in the Strategic Plans that the MAL HQ through the Department of Policy and Planning (DPP), all sector M&E functions are being coordinated, supported, overseen, analyzed and feedback provided (MAL, 2013). Considering the National Decentralization Policy for Zambia, the location of the coordination and oversight for M&E function seems to be appropriate even though there may be practical challenges in the implementation. Although the health sector M&E is equally overseen and coordinated by the MOH HQ under the Planning Department, there are challenges which come as a result of many actors such as donors, NGOs and other private stakeholders involved. Mainly, there are coordination and rationalization problems among these stakeholders in the health sector upon which the agriculture sector has an advantage with less active actors involved in the sector (agriculture).
Further, the comparative advantage of the agriculture sector M&E results from the fact that the DPP has a good linkage with all major stakeholders in the sector. It is simpler through the DPP to coordinate M&E information across M&E structures for all stakeholders at national, provincial and district levels (vertical downward accountability). In addition, being a growth sector, agriculture has an expanded private sector with many active stakeholders whose M&E arrangements are to some good extent fairly coordinated with those of the agriculture sector M&E system. For example, the private sector through common arrangements is obliged to formerly report all its activities to the agriculture sector while a lot of forums also exist where both the public and private sectors meet to share, harmonize and improve sector performance (MAL, 2013; 2002).

5.3.2. Sector Capacity for Analysis

Part of the requirement to strengthen the supply side of sector M&E systems is to have functional structures and capacities that are responsible for analyzing M&E data in order to make them relevant and useful for a range of stakeholders. In fact, “it is only by analyzing the results and using them to evaluate policies and programs that one may realize the benefit of monitoring systems” (Bedi et al., 2006:36). In the case of Zambia, some institutional arrangements have been put in place to carry out the function of analyzing sector M&E data.

- Sectoral Departments of Planning

The M&E function in both sectors of health and agriculture is mandated to the respective Departments of Planning. These departments located under their respective ministry HQs host the main M&E units with the responsibility of overseeing and coordinating all issues related to sector M&E. It is important to acknowledge here that the location of these departments is very strategic especially in the context of the National Decentralization Policy as well as the PRS. The ministry HQs are appropriate locations for sector M&E functions since all major processes such as planning, budgeting and policy making are undertaken from there (GRZ, 2002; Bossert et al., 2003).

In terms of the current M&E capacity, the assessment results (table 1 above) have indicated that the agriculture sector M&E system is better (2.3 score) than the health sector M&E (1.7 score). Essentially, it means that there are more elements of stronger M&E capacity in the agriculture sector as compared to the health sector M&E.
On a practical aspect, it entails that in comparison with the agriculture sector, the health sector M&E system fails to generate, manage and use system outputs to inform management decisions and policy making processes at various sector levels and beyond. The diagnostic exercise has revealed that despite both sectors facing limitations in skilled human resources, the situation was worse under the health sector. Similarly, other challenges include the dilapidated sector infrastructure (computers, databases and data management software programs) and the lack of budget independence. The poor work conditions of service in the M&E units as well as the non availability of champions to help improve things are yet other impediments. Poor work conditions for the demanding work of M&E can lead to massive brain-drain if not addressed properly (Schacter, 2000).

The problems above are complex and might require a range of actions to resolve. Plans to build the M&E capacity of the MAL staff at all levels are mentioned while they remain vague for the health sector. For instance, some capacity building plans for the agriculture sector include attracting skilled staff in its M&E units from within and outside of the ministry through upgrading salaries in the sector. There are also plans to stock M&E units with computers and data management software programs to help in data capturing, transmission and storage (MAL, 2013, 2004; Saasa, 2003). The biggest challenge however is that these activity plans are highly uncoordinated, usually with no proper linkages between what is contained in the strategic plans and the MTEF priorities. As Holvoet and Inberg (2011) observed that although the importance of improving staff skills is usually recognized, there is no explicit M&E capacity building plan in place for most countries. Moreover, a good capacity plan for M&E may be necessary for enhanced substance and systemic aspects of results-based-management mechanisms.

To improve the capacity challenges in the two sectors, there is need to invest in skills to enable staff at central sector, provincial and district levels to cope up with all data challenges that come in form of collection, analysis, reporting, storage and dissemination. The first crucial step according to Holvoet et al. (2012) is for the sector to undertake a thorough diagnosis of current status of M&E skills and use this information to plan a strategy of capacity-building at all levels. Thus, Adrien (2003) notes that the best governments could do is to train civil servants in a range of M&E tools, techniques and processes that include poverty monitoring, logical framework, performance monitoring and make them appreciate the general concept of results-based
management. Additional skills in undertaking evaluations are also needed, such as programme and impact evaluation, policy and cost-benefit analyses (McGranahan et al., 1985).

In addition, donors have been interested in strengthening M&E systems for sectors in Zambia. With the commitments to the principles of alignment, harmonization and managing for results as stipulated in the PD and the AAA, donor support to improve sector M&E has been positive to some extent. However, due to some problems highlighted above, the credibility of sector systems leave much to be desired and most donors become hesitant to fully align and harmonize their systems. Instead, they end up implementing their own parallel M&E exercises, a practice which has further weakened the M&E systems of sectors such as those of the health and agriculture in Zambia (OECD/DAC, 2011b). Therefore, only when the sector M&E systems are seen to be stronger shall it be probably meaningful for the donors to completely harmonize and align to country monitoring systems (Chigunta and Matshalaga, 2010; MOH, 2013).

- Ministry of Finance – Department of Monitoring and Evaluation

Strong linkages between sector M&E and central or national level M&E are considered to be an important requirement for functional country-level M&E arrangements. National-level leadership and commitment thus becomes vital for the whole-of-government M&E system success. As Schacter (2000:8) observed, “the absence of local leadership of, and commitment to, governance (especially M&E) reforms has been perhaps the single most important constraint to efforts to build sound governance in Sub-Saharan Africa”. The assessment results have however shown that this aspect is not well developed for both M&E systems of the health and agriculture sectors. A score of two (2) has been given to both sectors, implying that only elements of vertical upward linkages exist. For both sector systems, there is hardly any coordination and meaningful linkages between sector M&E unit with the central M&E system, in this case the M&E Department located at MOF.

On paper, the vertical upward linkages are sufficiently acknowledged and indeed institutionally, the central M&E system is supposed to play the role of oversight and coordination for the government-wide M&E arrangements (see M&E institutional and operational frameworks for Zambia above). Both the NDPs and Sector Strategic Plans for health and agriculture have elaborated the structural linkages that needed to exist between the central and sector M&E. But practically, this is not the case. APRs have revealed that rarely is there coordination between the
two levels. The linkages are rather ad hoc. For the moment, only reports related to APR compilation are demanded by the central M&E. In fact, it is not clear whether the central M&E provides any backstopping to the health and agriculture sector M&E systems. For example, not even trainings on harmonizing M&E practices among line ministries are mentioned in the documents reviewed. Furthermore, although the 2007 APR recommended the need for enhanced role of the MOF in strengthening health sector M&E system, no practical suggestions were made on how to explicitly do this. Such an interface was expected to improve M&E systems in all MPSAs (GRZ, 2007).

It is also surprising to observe that the agriculture sector which depends on the MOF funding for most of its programmes equally has poor linkages with the central M&E system. It can only be assumed therefore that the slightly improved M&E system for agriculture can most likely be attributed to internal motivation within the MAL to develop a strong M&E. The sector portrays elements of possessing an internal M&E ‘champion’ although there is no explicit mention of an individual behind these positive efforts. In that case, it may be understood that the agriculture sector M&E unit is acting as a ‘self motivated champion’. Institutionalized M&E champions can go a long way in building and sustaining M&E systems (Ronette and Tania, 2010).

5.3.3. M&E Outputs and Dissemination

Schiavo-Campo (2005) explains that for there to be sound accountability in government operations, a guarantee for transparency need to be in place. However, such an arrangement can only work when linkages and communication of M&E outputs across sectors and other stakeholders are well coordinated and functional. Linkages such as those between central government (MOF) and sectors, including other sub-national levels would be crucial. Also the collaboration and integration of CSOs and donor M&E aspects would too be useful to the strengthening of sector M&E systems. Notwithstanding the above, M&E outputs first of all need to be generated and packaged in various and multifunctional formats to benefit a wide range of audiences (UNDP, 2002).

Nevertheless, Bedi et al. (2006) reveals that it is usually hard to prove how PRS M&E information was being integrated into policy and decision making processes of most developing countries. A lot of impediments like weak demand for M&E information, poor coordination and data discrepancies among others have crippled the promotion of results-based decision making.
Thus, dissemination of M&E outputs to relevant stakeholders and getting their feedback can go a long way in improving the ‘supply side’ of sector M&E systems and contribute to poverty reduction.

Therefore, feedback and learning needs are a significant ingredient which good M&E systems seek to provide in addition to the accountability needs and once learning occurs, the benefits can be wider or even global (Savedoff et al., 2006). Like it is the case for most other criteria, the assessment results indicate that the agriculture sector M&E system has an improved feedback mechanism (score of 3) compared to that of the health sector M&E (score of 2). The agriculture sector M&E has a relatively more developed approach to reporting, dissemination and integration of information although it might not be as explicit and consistent as desired. As for the health sector M&E, only elements of good reporting, dissemination and information integration exist.

Nevertheless, the agriculture sector has an extra advantage which is the National Agriculture Information Services (NAIS), an initiative which uses both radio and TV programmes to report and disseminate relevant information to farmers across the country. The limitation though is on the clarity of feedback integration. It is not well explained in the sector policies how the M&E information was for instance integrated into decision making and policy influence especially at decentralized levels. As far as possible however, there is a good attempt towards explaining the type of reports and dissemination strategies for different stakeholders placed at various locations in the structure of the sector. Such formal structures and arrangements (NAIS) can ultimately be a motivation to produce M&E information of high quality and credibility (Morra Imas and Rist, 2009). Equally, the health sector runs radio and TV programmes but the information disseminated has more to do with health awareness as opposed to giving feedback on health programmes in line with the strategic plans and NDP targets. Similarly, the annual health bulletins only report on selected indicators without giving any analysis to explain the relationship between the programmes implemented and the indicator results (MOH, 2011; 2009).

Thus, given the general current underdevelopment of the health and agriculture sector M&E systems, it could be significant that concerted efforts between government and donors are enhanced. When the government, donors and key stakeholders begin to view M&E as a shared responsibility, it may be easy to invest in capacity building and harmonizing stakeholder
information needs (World Bank, 2003). Hence, investment in information quality, reporting and dissemination dimensions can go a long way in creating strengthened supply sides of sector M&E systems. For example, media campaigns as well as the use of vernacular versions of key M&E result outputs may help to open up demand and use of M&E information at all levels within and outside of the sectors (Holvoet and Inberg, 2012a).

5.3.4. Role of the Central Statistical Office in Sector M&E

On the supply side, another important matter arising from the assessment results concerns the role of the Central Statistical Office in the strengthening of sector M&E systems. The results indicate that the Statistics Office is better linked with the agriculture sector M&E system (score of 3) than that of the health sector (score of 2). Overall, the number of surveys that the Central Statistics Office conducts jointly with the agriculture M&E unit are more and relatively regular (Crop Forecasting and Post Harvest surveys which are annual exercises) compared to the health sector (mainly the DHS, which come after 5 years). The frequency of interaction might therefore provide some insights on why the agriculture sector is relatively better linked to the Statistics Office than health. Indeed, through these annual exercises, the agriculture sector M&E remains in constant collaboration with the Central Statistics Office. During the surveys, the Statistics Office conducts a range of capacity building trainings around data collection, methodology as well as in interpretation and use of survey data (MAL, 2013). For the health sector, the only surveys are the DHSs which come every five years.

Nevertheless, there is an indication under both sectors that the Statistical Office was not consistent in its surveys in terms of timeliness thus ended up delaying in providing information. The overarching challenge which the Central Statistical Office of Zambia faces is limited budget for its operations. Lack of funds could probably be the reason why it is also difficult for the Statistics Office to provide M&E backstopping exercises to sectors. In their country studies, Bedi et al. (2006:30) found that, “National Statistics Institutes tend to prioritize large survey and statistical operations for which donor funding is readily available, leaving little time for other functions”. The financial constraint of the Statistics Office can also lead to poor evaluation exercises hence producing indicator data that may not be credible (Bamberger et al., 2004). Nonetheless, the Zambian government has no choice but to find a way to strengthen the statistics office and create operational linkages with sectors so that all public information could be
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certified for timeliness, credibility, relevance, accuracy, accessibility, interpretability, coherence, and methodological soundness (Ronette and Tania, 2010).

5.4. M&E Demand Side – Capacity to Create and Use Information

For sector M&E systems to be built, strengthened, sustained and used as tools of performance improvement in the context of Poverty Reduction Strategies (PRS), systems should possess the capacity to generate complete and relevant information (supply-side). Of more importance in addition is the capacity of such systems to create a broad scope of demand for the outputs they produce (demand-side). Bedi et al. (2006) notes with emphasis that countries need to develop the demand side of their PRS M&E systems as far much as possible while organizing the supply side. It is the demand side of M&E systems that guarantees the quality of information which thereafter is used to attract the attention of various stakeholders who need it for poverty reduction in their programming, policy-making and daily decision-making.

This section strives to tackle the question ‘Why is the ‘demand side’ of the agriculture sector M&E system better than that of the health sector?’ To achieve this objective, a number of elements are considered. A broad range of uses and users for M&E information can be distinguished as shown in Box 2 below. M&E information is demanded practically at all levels of government from national, provincial, district and community levels. Programmes and projects also require M&E information for their operations and decisions.
Box 2: The Many Uses and Users of Monitoring and Evaluation Information

1. Performance reporting

| 1.1 National performance report | • A national performance report for parliament and citizens on national goals and priorities
|  | • Reporting on progress for Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers
|  | • Reporting on progress for the MDGs

| 1.2 Sector/ministry performance report | • Reporting on performance in ministries’ annual reports
|  | • Reporting on sector performance to parliamentary committees
|  | • Reporting on sector performance to thematic groups

| 1.3 Programme and project-level performance reporting | • Periodic reporting on performance at the level of programmes and projects to allow relevant managers within a ministry to exercise accountability and governance
|  | • Progress updates to general public on key projects

2. Informing policy development and strategic planning discussions

| 2.1 National-level discussions | • Input into policy and planning deliberations by cabinets, committees, relevant central agencies, national organizations, etc., on national policy and strategic direction for the country

| 2.2 Sector/ministry-level discussions | • Input into policy and planning deliberations by senior officials at the ministerial, sectoral and committee levels on sector goals and objectives and their alignment with national goals and objectives

| 2.3 Programme/project-level discussions | • Input into policy and planning deliberations by senior executives of a ministry and/or managers at the programme and project levels within a particular ministry
|  | • Input into cross-ministry policy and planning deliberations by senior officials of a sector

3. Informing budget and funding discussions

| 3.1 National budget formulation | • Using performance information as input to central agency deliberations on funding allocations for the national budgets

| 3.2 Funding decisions within ministries | • Using performance information at project and programme levels as input into discussions and decisions on future funding

4. Programme-level knowledge – improvement – management oversight

| 4.1 Programme and project level | • Using performance information to monitor the progress of programmes in meeting their objectives and measuring impacts attained to date
|  | • Using performance information and knowledge about programmes to adjust and improve programmes so as to achieve expected results

Source: The United Nations (2013)

Indeed, the diagnostic results show that the agriculture sector M&E has more capacity to generate information and at the same time create demand for the use of it (score of 2.3). To the contrary, the assessment results also clearly show that the health sector is less capable of creating demand for the M&E information (score of 1.7). A number of factors in the diagnostic exercises indicate why the current M&E statuses for the health and agriculture sectors are at variance.

5.4.1. Linking M&E with the Budget Process

The M&E demand side can be strengthened by carefully linking M&E and the budget process. Since sectors rely on central government funding for most of their programme activities, the
arrangement can be used as an opportunity to link M&E information to the budget process and this according to Bedi et al. (2006) works as a hook for inducing demand for M&E outputs.

Further, for the linkages criteria, the overall average score for agriculture is 2.6 while health has 2 and specifically for the criteria on linking M&E to the processes of budgeting and planning, again the agriculture sector scores higher with 3 compared to health’s score of 2 (see annex 1). Essentially, the agriculture sector attempts to elaborate on how information generated from the M&E system feeds into the budget and planning processes. According to the Agriculture Strategic Plan (2013-2016), M&E information is used to inform the preparation of the sector MTEF and other budgetary requirements. It is also mentioned that the MOF critically reviews the agriculture MTEF during the disbursements of sector funds to ensure that all activities conform to the priorities as identified in the SNDP (MAL, 2013).

For the health sector, it is not clear on how M&E information is practically used in such mechanisms as the MTEF and SWAp. Nonetheless, there is need for sector managers and indeed all public officers responsible to demand and avail relevant PRS M&E system outputs to inform MTEF processes. Moreover, creating a performance culture that seeks the use of evidence-based information for decision and policy making can be a potential tool for achieving poverty reduction outcomes (Bedi et al., 2006; Robinson and Last, 2009; World Bank, 1998).

The fact that the agriculture sector largely depends on central government funding for most of its programmes, linking its M&E to the MTEF works as an incentive. The agriculture sector Strategic Plan (2013-2016) mentions that without realistic funding of the MTEF projections by MOF, the agriculture sector has no alternative resources but to scale down on its proposed activities and consequently not meet all the set targets (MAL, 2013). With many donors active in the health sector and each carrying varying M&E needs, the linkages with the MTEF are usually problematic and require a lot of coordination and rationalization efforts to succeed.

Further, there is need for the two sectors of health and agriculture to seriously consider other forms of incentives for M&E because focusing on linkages with the budgets only merely undermines success for more stakeholders to demand for the M&E outputs. Mackay (2007) for
instance talks of carrots, sticks and sermons\textsuperscript{13} as a way to innovate and contextualize M&E incentives (Rist and Vedung, 2005; World Bank, 2007b).

5.4.2. Use of Sector M&E Information by Parliament

Parliaments, as viewed by Schiavo-Campo (2005) were supposed to be the primary consumers of M&E information because of their roles of representing, overseeing and approving budgets pertaining to public expenditures. For without full access to M&E information from all sectors, parliament becomes inevitably incapacitated to stop or minimize corruption and other forms of service delivery challenges facing the public service (Schacter, 2000). Surprisingly however, more focus seems to be given to strengthening parliament’s capacity around budget approvals to the brutal negligence of the need to upgrade parliamentarians’ analytical capacity to enable them engage the executive in tougher performance issues. In addition, Bedi et al. (2006) hold a view that the participation of parliaments in PRS M&E systems can potentially bring legitimacy, country ownership, and the voice of constituencies into the sector and national policy processes. Thus, sectoral M&E information could be greatly useful to engage and influence the executive arm of government on how best to utilize public resources (Ronette and Tania, 2010; Mackay, 2011).

Unfortunately, the diagnostic results indicate a score of one (1) for both the health and agriculture sectors regarding the participation of the Zambian Parliament in strengthening and using sector M&E information (see annex 1). This poor score entails that very little action has been taken to link parliament to the sector M&E systems. In both ministries, it means that the role of parliament is not recognized and there is no alignment with parliamentary control and oversight procedures. Actually, Parliament is not mentioned as a stakeholder in all sector documents (strategy plans, NDPs, and APRs) and no linkages exist. Apart from the ordinary parliamentary presentations made by the respective Ministers and the ad hoc consultations by the Parliamentary Committees, no institutionalized arrangements exist linking sector M&E and parliament directly.

In addition, this also means parliament does not participate in JARs and SAGs. It is not clear why such arrangements are like that and no attempts have been made by both sectors to explain the discrepancies. Since parliament plays the role of checks and balances for government

\textsuperscript{13} Or what Mercer (2002) refers to as ‘democratic consolidation’ where CSOs may engage the state on issues around anti corruption, human rights abuses, ineffective legal systems and generally on poor governance.
performance, it might be understood that this silence is not surprising because M&E systems have the potential to reveal accountability, corrupt practices and many other tough issues (Kusek and Rist, 2004; Clements et al., 2008). So, the linkages are either weakened or nonexistent. Therefore, this leaves the Zambian parliament only relying on selected reports (APRs and ministerial statements). Since parliament has both the health and agriculture sub-committees, one would expect parliament to be linked to the sector M&E but there is no mention of such arrangements. In this way, parliament’s role to demand for sector M&E products remains passive and consequently fails to strengthen M&E systems themselves.

The non involvement of parliament in sector M&E could in fact be a complex issue. In as much as there could be counter efforts by government bureaucrats to keep parliament away from knowing what wrong practices took place, other reasons could be that Zambian parliament itself has weak M&E capacity. This has potential to hinder demand for M&E information by parliament as Bedi et al. (2006) observed that weak capacity of parliaments is among the key reasons why parliaments do not get involved in M&E in most Sub-Sahara African countries. Unless a functional parliamentary committee system exists, one with adequate analytical capacity as well as sufficient institutional resources, the Zambian parliament will continue to be of less usefulness to the strengthening of sector M&E systems and indeed the whole-of-government M&E.

5.4.3. Use of Sector M&E Information by Donors

Under the Paris Declaration (PD) and recommitted during the Accra Agenda for Action (AAA), it is expected of all Development Partners (DPs) to align and harmonize their systems of delivering aid to those of developing countries (OECD/DAC, 2011a). Thus, donors are understood to be important partners in building and strengthening developing countries’ M&E systems. In Zambia, the good will of donors is well acknowledged in this line (GRZ, 2010). However, the results of the diagnosis have shown that both the agriculture and health sector M&E systems have limited participation of DPs in M&E exercises (with score of 2 for both – see annex 1). Although elements of donor involvement exist, their M&E role is not explicitly recognized and there are no clear procedures elaborated for their participation. In both sectors, the DPs are members of the SAGs and JARs. Nonetheless, mention is made that the SAGs and JARs are not very active especially for the agriculture SAG (MAL, 2013b).
Consequently, what seems to be clear is that DPs’ role in strengthening sector M&E is rather mixed. The health sector is reported to have some aspects of success (with donors) and indeed, that could be attributed to the pressure from the DPs who usually want to get evidence of their support but this is a practice whose sustainability cannot be guaranteed (Cammack, 2007). In fact, Schacter (2000) observed that in most Sub-Saharan African countries, the syndrome of ‘donors in the M&E driver’s seat’ has undermined success in M&E evolution and that the need to discourage such practices was urgent.

Further, the linkages between sector M&E and donor funded projects still need efforts in order to ensure that information flows are institutionally arranged and coordinated. In that regard, the 2009 Mid-Term Review (MTR) revealed that discrepancies between sector M&E systems and those of donors created most of the challenges on information accessibility and use. Thus, there is need to use the good lessons from donor assistance channeled through General Budget Support and SWAps which have been reported to be positive in Zambia (GRZ, 2009).

Moreover, donors as evidenced in some studies (OECD/DAC Monitoring Surveys on the implementation of the PD, 2006, 2008 and 2011) do not easily harmonize and align to recipient country systems and monitoring frameworks. Donors point to the fact that M&E frameworks of developing countries are weak and inadequate. Even as observed by the World Bank (2003), mostly parallel M&E systems have been perpetuated by donors and that such enclave practices have ended up weakening M&E capacities of the public sectors for developing countries. These challenges are more evident in Zambia’s health sector which has plenty of donors who still run parallel M&E exercises. Therefore to reduce the confusion, it is imperative that a middle ground is negotiated between government and the concerned donors. Essentially, it is through unified frameworks that sector M&E may be strengthened (Holvoet and Renard, 2005).

5.4.4. Use of Sector M&E by Civil Society

With the coming of PRSPs, CSOs received a great deal of attention in the process of economic growth and poverty alleviation. For most developing countries such as Zambia, CSOs became key users of M&E information and since then, some of them have continued to engage governments on various issues concerning the management and utilization of public resources (GRZ, 2002). Or what Mercer (2002) refers to as ‘democratic consolidation’ where CSOs may engage the state on issues around anti corruption, human rights abuses, and ineffective legal
systems and generally on poor governance. Thus, CSOs are indeed significant actors with potential to strengthen the demand side of sector M&E systems through their use of system information to enhance their activities such as advocating for pro poor policies.

The assessment results have shown that there is minimal participation of CSOs in both the health and agriculture sectors (both with score of 2 – see annex 1). In the two sectors, it is not clearly explained how the CSOs are involved in strengthening M&E systems, yet this is an essential requirement for successful systems. One way to induce the participation of CSOs in poverty reduction programmes is through strengthened M&E systems that produce relevant and useful information to civil society themselves (Bedi et al., 2006). For CSOs to be effective, they need to operate differently by initiating various platforms to gather public performance information and engage government on issues. Such initiatives as the ‘Citizens Report Cards’ that are used by citizens to express feedback on their satisfaction about the quality of public services provided to them can go a long way to help CSOs to engage government on pro poor policies and poverty reduction programmes (Ravindra, 2004; Clark et al., 2003).

Sector Advisory Groups (SAGs) are the only platforms mentioned available for CSOs to participate. The health SAG is performing much better (score of 3) compared to that of the agriculture SAG (score of 2 – see annex 1). There are regular meetings for the health SAG while the one for agriculture meets irregularly but for both, the contents of the meetings rarely tackle the core M&E challenges facing the sectors. Nevertheless, some CSO members such as NGOs prefer not to take active roles in SAG meetings as well as Joint Annual Reviews (common in the case of health) for fear of co-optation and control by government (Bedi et al., 2006; MOF, 2008).

Moreover, CSOs in Zambia still remain a great untapped potential to help government build and sustain functional M&E systems at all levels. Although generally hampered with fragmentations, CSOs can be a sound and organized way to provide constructive criticism for governance. But this opportunity seems to be always misunderstood; instead, both CSOs and government perceive each other as rivals and thus fail to consider themselves as having complementary roles (Schacter, 2000). Thus, resolving the challenge may go a long way in making the civil society more useful to M&E. Further, if the politics of M&E between government and CSOs continue to be at variance, the critical role of CSOs to fight corruption by demanding for greater government transparency and accountability shall be disillusioned (Hauge, 2001).
CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1. Conclusions

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) has become the ‘buzz’ word in the development arenas of both the developed and developing countries. Proponents of M&E within the field of development have contended that well functioning M&E systems can contribute highly to the provision of necessary information for use at all levels of the policy cycle. More specifically, M&E is acclaimed for improving policy and planning, enhances accountability as well as supports various management functions. Nevertheless, the advocates are also aware that M&E does not have an intrinsic value but rather the benefits have to be sought for in the context of how much M&E information is being used by decision-makers and in influencing policy.

The arrival of the Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRS) initiative just before the New Millennium in 2000 spanned the emphasis on having stronger M&E systems at country level. Countries were demanded to explicitly elaborate how the PRSPs were going to be implemented, monitored and evaluated in order to measure the successes and challenges that still needed to be reconsidered. Zambia, implemented her two PRSPs between 2000 and 2004 and after that success, the country was pardoned over US$3 billion of her external debt from the World Bank and IMF through the Highly Indebted Poor Country (HIPC) Initiative (GRZ, 2006a).

The subject of this dissertation centered on sector M&E systems of Zambia’s Health and Agriculture Sectors. Using the results of the 2011 OECD/DAC Monitoring Survey on the implementation of the Paris Declaration (PD), the paper started by illustrating the current poor performing status of Zambia’s whole-of-government M&E system. Results of indicator 11 (Managing for Results) shows how much Zambia’s country level M&E was inadequate in providing credible information about poverty reduction. This became the basis and motivation to conduct a comparative case study for the M&E systems of the health and agriculture sectors. Consequently, the diagnostic results have shown that the agriculture sector M&E system is better performing compared to that of the health sector (see annex 1).

What has clearly come out is that for Zambia to have a whole-of-government M&E system which is stronger and able to produce relevant information for concerned stakeholders and development processes, successful sector M&E is inevitable. Because government implements
its poverty reduction strategies (the NDPs) through line ministries, sector M&E arrangements become critical inputs into the achievement of national development goals.

However, after conducting an M&E diagnosis of the health and agriculture sectors, it has become apparent that there are many factors that affect the operation of sector M&E systems even when both were being implemented within the general framework of government M&E arrangement. For instance, the different linkages and relationships with CSOs, donors, parliament, private sector, national statistics institution and the national-level M&E. Whether there are champions to lead the process of M&E reform in sectors is another factor that may determine and separate success from failure. On the whole, the agriculture sector M&E system has better ability to supply relevant information to several of its stakeholders while the health sector has challenges doing so. Equally, the M&E system of the agriculture sector has a comparatively well developed demand side, thereby able to stimulate different actors to ask and use its M&E outputs. The demand side of the health sector M&E is also less developed in comparison, meaning that most of the stakeholders in the sector were not sufficiently using the information for their management decisions as well as for influencing policy improvements.

Finally, for the M&E systems of the health and agriculture sectors to be used as instruments of managing the implementation of sector strategies and contribute to the national poverty reduction agenda, it is crucial to focus on strengthening both their supply and demand sides. But like it is currently done under the agriculture sector, there will be need to ensure that the demand side is organized quickly while the supply side is also being developed.

6.2. Recommendations for Policy Improvement

For the future, the following should be considered in order to improve M&E systems in Zambia:

- Sector level

**Conduct thorough sector M&E diagnoses:** For both sectors of health and agriculture, no M&E assessment has been done before to identify strengths and weaknesses so that this would be used as benchmark for improving sector M&E systems. In the absence of this assessment, it is impractical to know the underlying factors for success and failure (Kusek and Rist, 2004). Thus, to conduct a thorough diagnosis to determine the current statuses of M&E systems is crucial first step to identify gaps and use the findings for dialogue to find better environments of conducting M&E with stakeholders (UN, 2013).
Create forum for inter-line ministry M&E experience sharing: Since government is a broad entity with all line ministries expected to implement the NDPs, it would be wise for all sector M&E units to consider sharing experiences through common forums, preferably convened by the M&E Department at MOF as the national coordinator. This will greatly act as a source of knowledge and can help improve M&E practices and capacities at sector level and subsequently assist the national M&E to identify the areas for improvement (Holvoet and Rombouts, 2008b).

Enhance the incentive structure for the use of M&E information: Lack of motivation to supply or demand for M&E information has been largely attributed to weak incentive arrangements in both sectors of health and agriculture. A range of possible incentives can be explored including technical, political, financial management and skills training (see Prennushi et al., 2001; Bemelmans-Vedic et al., 2005; Ostrom et al., 2002).

Engage MOF to provide Sector M&E backstopping: The capacity of the Department of M&E at MOF need to be enhanced so that it is able to provide necessary support to sector M&E systems. Sectors also need to proactively seek the help of the national-level M&E system.

Initiate and strengthen Parliamentary linkages and oversight: The diagnostic results have shown that no formal links exist between the Zambian National Assembly and sector M&E systems of health and agriculture (see annex 1). This may call for explicit initiatives such as linking sector M&E units and the Public Accounts Committee (PAC) as well as other sector specific sub-committees of Parliament.

- National Level

Strengthen the ‘evaluation’ function in M&E: As observed by Bamberger (2000), trends show that M&E resources have continued to be devoted to the monitoring function with little attention to the evaluation function. Thus, Schiavo-Campo (2005) cautions that monitoring exercises need not to crowd-out genuine evaluation. In the case of the Zambian M&E system, the ‘E’ is given less priority while more attention is rendered to the ‘M’. Thus, government should not leave these clarifications to chance, instead institutionalize them whenever possible (see Morra Imas and Rist, 2009; Mackay, 2007; Pitman et al., 2005; Nairobi M&E Network et al., 2002).

Guarantee country leadership and ownership of M&E systems: The Zambian government should consider working towards decentralized ownership, control and sustainability of her
whole-of-government M&E systems. It is not sustainable enough for the donor community to be the ones funding evaluations and strengthening M&E systems (Bamberger, 1991; Kusek and Rist, 2004). This requires the presence of government ‘M&E champions’ in almost all sectors. At national level, the MOF, through its minister and the Department of M&E need to act as strong advocates of sound public resource management of which M&E is cardinal for success.

**Strengthen legislation for M&E:** Although there are provisions in the national constitution and other legal instruments to guide and protect PFM systems, Zambia needs a law that particularly promotes and elaborates stronger M&E practice in the public sector. The current ad hoc and generalized provisions lack explicit legal backing and the consequences of this gap are weaknesses in the overall implementation of the M&E function by government. When done, the strengthened M&E legislation will potentially resolve the weak role the Zambian parliament plays in enhancing sector and national M&E systems.

6.3. **Recommendations for Further Research**

Further studies will be needed in the following areas:

**Study the Politics of M&E in Zambia:** M&E is mainly about technical and political issues although the political aspect is usually crowded out (Kusek and Rist, 2004; Palumbo, 1987; Leftwich, 2008). There are a lot of grey areas which require more clarification in sector M&E and indeed national-level M&E. Major challenges include weak M&E coordination, autonomy and overall poor power relations between departments and line ministries. The M&E role of the Office of the Auditor General (OAG), Parliament, Central Statistical Office and CSOs need further elaboration (Holvoet and Rombouts, 2008a; Hickey and Mohan, 2008).

**Investigate best M&E practices from other countries which Zambia may adopt and adapt:** Growing literature and evidence about M&E implementation at national level has continued to increase globally. Both the developed and developing countries alike have stepped up efforts to devise various forms of M&E to improve management of public resources and achieve poverty reduction for their populations. The experiences of many developing countries in particular will be leveraging to the Zambian case. The Latin American success stories of Colombia and Chile as well as some African countries like Uganda, Tanzania and Ghana would make useful contributions towards enhancing Zambia’s M&E arrangements (Castro, 2009; May et al., 2006).
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### Annex 1: Score of Zambia’s Health and Agriculture Sectors on the Checklist for Quality Assessment of Sector Level M&E Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>HEALTH SECTOR (MOH)</th>
<th>AGRICULTURE SECTOR (MAL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCORE</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. M&amp;E Plan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Various documents are there in the MOH describing the M&amp;E Plan for the sector. Key among these includes the National Health Strategic Plans (both the 2006-2010 and 2011-2015), the Health Policy and the National Development Plans (NDPs). The role of M&amp;E is explained as that of overseeing and reporting progress on the implementation of sector strategic plans. But there is no explicit and comprehensive elaboration as to why and for whom M&amp;E information was intended for. However, what to monitor and evaluate is clear to some extent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. M versus E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The two terms (monitoring and evaluation) are clearly differentiated in the NHSPs and the SNDP and further understood as complementary to each other. However, the details of their execution are limited, e.g. the practical approaches to monitoring and evaluation are only implicitly mentioned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Autonomy &amp; impartiality (accountability)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>All main sector documents (NHSPs and NDPs) do not mention of the need for M&amp;E to be autonomous or impartial. The budget independence of M&amp;E does not come out as a necessary issue. There is no clear space where tough M&amp;E issues raised in reports are debated or included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Feedback</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The M&amp;E Plan makes recognition of the importance of reporting, dissemination and feedback mechanisms and efforts to improve these are already in place according to the current NHSP (2011-2015) and the NDP. Unfortunately, there is no explicit consistence in approach and integration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Alignment planning &amp; budgeting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>It is not clearly elaborated how M&amp;E is being integrated in the processes of planning and budgeting. Nonetheless, there is mention that the challenge exists for M&amp;E information to be adopted in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
most decision making. Nevertheless, through the MTEF and SWAp mechanisms, arrangements to integrate M&E are also acknowledged but it is limited and rather ad hoc. sector strategy and upon which the M&E information is used (to some extent). It is also mentioned that the MOF critically reviews the agriculture MTEF during to disbursements to ensure that all activities conform to the priorities as identified in the SNDP. However, these acknowledgements are clear on paper yet reality/practice on the ground might be different.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Methodology</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>The agriculture sector M&amp;E has elaborated the indicators for the sector in the strategic plans (2013-2016) as well as in the SNDP. A less harmonized but comprehensive list of indicators exist for all the programmes under each department and these are essentially aligned with the indicators of the agriculture sector in the matrix of the SNDP. However, it is also acknowledged that the current indicators were still undergoing some further changes to try and get a set that was comprehensive enough to the satisfaction of stakeholders’ needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Selection of indicators</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>The sector has in place consolidated lists of performance indicators for all different programmes and these are later harmonized with the KPIs in the NDPs. However, the NHSP (2011-2015) mentions that these indicators are still undergoing regular changes to try as much as possible to include the information needs of other stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Quality of indicators</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The health sector indicators are as much as possible formulated in a SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-bound) manner. Although not all indicators have baselines, most of them have. In fact, all health sector KPIs in the SNDP have baselines and clear targets. There is admission of problems to measure some of the indicators, particularly those at lower levels.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>An effort has been made to formulate all performance indicators in a SMART way (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound). Similarly, all the sector indicators in the SNDP matrix are linked to identified baselines and multi-year targets. There is also recognition in the Sector Strategy (2013-2016) that challenges were faced when trying to measure and set baselines. In some cases, information was not available and intelligent guesses were used to come up with proxy indicators and baselines and in some cases targets.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Disaggregation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>At the very basic level, the sector M&amp;E has made attempts to disaggregate health data but this has been problematic. A few districts and health facilities are reported to be practicing data disaggregation. However, the indicators in the NHSP and SNDP are not disaggregated. Ways are being made to resolve this problem for the whole sector M&amp;E system. So, the disaggregation being done is mostly limited to gender and region and less on economic and other segregations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No indicator is segregated in any form, but only aggregates. However, there is acknowledgement in the Strategic Plan (2013-2016) of the need to segregate data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Selection criteria</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>As far as the indicator selection criteria are concerned, evidence is acknowledged in the key sector documents (NHSP and NDPs). However, although the documents mention that a wide range of stakeholders were consulted in a participatory approach, it is not mentioned who actually took part in the selection of indicators. Thus, to some good extent, the criteria for selection are elaborated while it is not clear who was particularly involved in the selection process.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The selection criteria are vaguely elaborated. Apart from the involvement of the technocrats at MAL, the other consultation mentioned is the references to international indicator standards on agriculture. There is no mention of local stakeholders’ consultations especially the private sector, a practice which is crucial for successful data collection, reporting and use. Such omissions can have adverse effects on both the supply and demand side of an M&amp;E system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Priority setting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Clearly, the NHSPs acknowledges the need to have a limited number of performance indicators and this is due to a number of reasons, among them dilapidated infrastructure, shortages in skilled manpower and the wide scope covered by the sector (country-wide). But the number or list of indicators is</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Having in place a limited number of performance indicators are acknowledged in the Strategic Plan (2013-2016). With the wide coverage and large number of stakeholders, MAL puts indicator prioritization among the key. However, the current indicator lists are still considered transitional, meaning some changes are still possible depending on the shifts stakeholder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
still not exhaustive, though relatively smaller, but continues changing. It is acknowledged in the NHSP (2011-2015) that the changes will continue as a way of trying to accommodate stakeholder needs.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>11. Causality chain</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The health sector indicator-matrix presents indicators clearly at the levels of input, output, outcome and impact. However, there is an absence of the causality chain that links these indicators to clarify by showing how one level of interventions affected the next level. Such linkages are important especially when evaluating the overall relevance, effectiveness and impact of sector programmes and strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12. Methodologies used</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The indicators are well identified at input, output, outcome and impact levels in the indicator matrices of the Sector Strategy Plan (2013-2016) and SNDP but they are not linked in any logic. Yet, a causality chain is crucial in elaborating causal relationships between the development interventions, intermediate and final results/impact. There is however an acknowledgement of the need for linking indicators at various levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13. Data collection</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lots of details are given on the identified methodologies to be used to collect indicator data. There is good attempt to elaborate what methods were appropriate for monitoring exercises as well as evaluation processes. For instance, some surveys are preferred for evaluation while daily input data forms and exercises have been generated to capture monitoring data. What remains unclear however is how integrated these methodologies were.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(2011-2015) clearly links the prioritized indicators and the sources of data. Population-based surveys (DHS and national censuses) undertaken by the statistics office, field visits, HMIS, SAG and JAR reports are some of the data sources specified. The data collection tools. As explained above, the methodologies and data sources for agriculture have been well elaborated to some extent. The significance of selecting the sources of data as well as data collection tools is well acknowledged in the sector documents but limited examples of the methods and tools and given.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3a. Organisation:</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>The coordination and oversight organisational structure for the health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sector include the MOH HQ, the SAG, PDCCs and the DDCCs. These</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>structures exist at basically all levels of the sector throughout the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>country and these are platforms upon which M&amp;E information is expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to flow. Being located and overseen from the sector HQ, it is deemed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>an ideal place because all powers that be are there. It is however not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>clear the extent to which stakeholders influence M&amp;E although mention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>has been made that DPs have a lot of say in the sector M&amp;E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Coordination and</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Although the MAL has a well elaborated organisational structure upon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oversight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>which M&amp;E is undertaken, there have been lots of changes in the sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The latest one being the re-emerging of the general agriculture and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>livestock components in 2011 after the new government assumed power.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>These changes have come with M&amp;E functional challenges in the sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nevertheless, it is well mentioned in the Strategic Plans that the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ministry HQ is in charge of all M&amp;E coordination and oversight. MAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>has decentralized structures across the country at national, provincial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and district levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Joint Sector</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Despite the mere mention of the need to use Joint Annual Reviews (JARs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>as M&amp;E exercises, the agriculture has no active JARs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ultimately contributes to the realization of the PD principles of alignment and harmonization. Membership is limited to government health agencies and church affiliated (CHAZ) institutions.

16. Sector Working groups

|   |   | The health SAG is active and meets quarterly to deliberate on various sector performance issues. Membership of the SAG is wide including DPs, private sector, CSOs, NGOs and other government agencies involved in health interventions. Although the membership may not be stable to some extent, most stakeholders in the sector participate. MOH reports have mentioned that the quality of issues discussed in SAG meetings are not detailed on M&E. issues. |

2 The agriculture sector has a SAG with membership coming from different organizations (NGOs, CSOs, CPs and other government affiliated agencies). It is mentioned in the Strategic Plan (2013-2016) and some APRs that the SAG is active to some extent. Meetings of the SAG are sometimes irregular and this has impacted negatively on the SAG’s responsibility to offer appropriate M&E oversight.

17. Ownership

|   |   | Although it is mentioned in the NHSP that M&E information informs sector decision and policy making, there is no evidence how this was being done. However, what seems to be common practice is the demand of M&E reports by the MOF and this mainly is limited to information that goes into APR compilation. Equally, there is no mention of the presence of a sector champion, one who advocates for better sector M&E. M&E is therefore taken as a generally government requirement and not a sector specific mandate. |

3 Three key objectives of the current MAL Strategic Plan (2013-2016) border on improving sector M&E information. There is commitment from within the MAL to develop a system whose outputs are credible and useful to informing policy and decision making across government and beyond. It is not clear whether there is any M&E champion within the MAL to stimulate the need to build a stronger system.

18. Incentives

|   |   | The only reward and motivation for M&E information is the implicit link between planning and budgeting |

3 Only uncoordinated elements of the use of incentives are mentioned in the agriculture sector documents. The MTEF is the only major
through the MTEF. It is however not elaborated how this is translated into reality. This means that very limited incentives exist and need for more innovations and commitments is needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisation: linkages</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>The mechanism/incentive that seeks to use M&amp;E information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Linkage with Statistical office</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The linkage between the MAL M&amp;E system and the Central Statistical Office is acknowledged as important in the sector policy documents. Through agriculture surveys, the statistics office works with the sector M&amp;E system to generate data that feeds into performance reports for the sector. However, the role of the statistics office is not fully elaborated, for instance, there is no reference to other backstopping exercises to the sector M&amp;E system. One would expect that there are some training in data collection and M&amp;E information use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. ‘Horizontal’ integration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The agriculture sector M&amp;E is linked with different sub-sectors and semi-governmental institutions although the linkages are not so strong. There are point persons in most of the institutions responsible for gathering data and sharing it with the agriculture sector M&amp;E. Equally, the agriculture sector has a relatively large presence of private sector actors (being a growth sector) whose M&amp;E arrangements work in collaboration with the sector M&amp;E. However, the coordination is not too strong as well.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 21. ‘Vertical’ upward integration | 2     | 2     | On paper, the links between the agriculture sector M&E and the central M&E system located at MOF is recognized. Structurally, the central
reports related to APR compilation are demanded by the central M&E. Although it is clear on paper that the link was supposed to be stronger, what is practiced is totally different, the central M&E rarely provides any backstopping to the sector M&E. This somehow explains the weakness of the integration and further fragmentations in the sector M&E.

22. ‘Vertical’ downward integration

2

The linkages between the health sector M&E at MOH HQ and the lower levels are only convenient for information flowing from bottom-up. It is rare for feedback to flow downwards because the motivation to do so is almost non-existent. Thus, the linkages are hardly in existence.

3

The linkages between the decentralized M&E units and that of the sector M&E are elaborated. These links are well developed to some extent with information flows between the national level (sector M&E at HQ), provinces, districts and many times even up to the community level (farmer groups and co-operatives). For instance, information about crop harvesting and marketing, animal husbandry and farming methods flows well. The agriculture extension officers located in the rural areas work as M&E point persons and attempt as much as possible to share reports and information from higher levels.

23. Link with projects

2

Zambia’s health sector has a lot of DPs of which some of them are directly involved in implementing programmes. Under the PD to which Zambia is a signatory, all donors are expected to align and harmonize their systems to those of government. Although this has been a process, efforts to coordinate are there but this is rather done at limited scale. Both the current NHSP and APRs have revealed that since the misapplication of funds in the health

2

M&E system is supposed to play the role of oversight and coordination for the government-wide M&E arrangements. Both the NDPs and Sector Strategic Plans have elaborated the ideal linkages that needed to exist between the central and sector M&E. But practically, this is not the case. APRs have revealed that rarely is there coordination between the two levels.

Not too many private donor projects and vertical funds are present in the agriculture sector. However, there is mention of some limited efforts to link these DPs’ M&E with the sector M&E. Some NGOs (e.g. World Vision International, CARE International, PAM, FAO, etc) for instance who provide agricultural services in Zambia provide the sector M&E (at all levels) with various output and impact level information regarding their interventions. In fact, during some monitoring exercises and even evaluations, the MAL M&E participates as a key
sector during the period 2007 and 2008, some donors withdraw funding while others stayed but intensified oversight by implementing parallel M&E systems. This negatively impacted coordination of M&E systems.

partner. However, these linkages seem to be more ad hoc in design and may require a well institutionalized arrangement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Capacity</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Currently, the M&amp;E capacity for the agricultural sector is limited. The Strategic Plans, MIS Manual, NDPs and APRs have acknowledged this gap. At all levels (sector M&amp;E unit, provinces, districts and community), there are limited skills and financial resources to enhance M&amp;E functions. Nonetheless, there are efforts to address this weakness through facilitating the training of existing staff members in M&amp;E while organizing for a permanent solution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Present capacity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mention is made in the NHSP that the health sector has a human resource capacity crisis not only those related to health care provision generally, but also the capacities to generate, manage and use health information. The gap in M&amp;E skills is coupled with the increasing challenges resulting from dilapidated sector infrastructure. Limited and lack of budget independence is another bottleneck for the health sector M&amp;E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Problem acknowledged</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The problems that are identified in the sector documents (Strategic Plans, APRs, NDPs) include the M&amp;E skills, infrastructure (computers, databases and data management software programs) and financial constraints. Nevertheless, these problems have not been identified using a systematic diagnosis, which can be so useful to map out all the lacking areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Capacity building plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Plans to build the M&amp;E capacity of the MAL staff at all levels are present and these are mainly trainings. Some efforts are also being made to stock M&amp;E units with computers and data management software programs. The biggest challenge however is that these activity plans are highly uncoordinated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRITERIA</td>
<td>SCORE</td>
<td>SCORE</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Participation of actors outside government</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Parliament</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Zambian Parliament is not mentioned in all health sector documents (NHSPs, Health Policy, NDPs, and APRs) to be a stakeholder and no linkages are mentioned. Apart from the ordinary parliamentary presentations made by the MOH Minister and the ad hoc consultations by the Parliamentary Committee, no sort of arrangements exist linking sector M&amp;E and parliament. Parliament is neither a member of the health SAG nor the JARs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28. Civil Society</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29. Development Partners (DPs)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Through the agriculture SAG, the CSOs are mentioned to be participants in the management, monitoring and evaluation of the sector strategies and plans. But with the noted inactiveness of the SAG, CSOs’ participation in providing sector M&amp;E feedback/oversight is limited. Procedures about CSOs’ participation on the SAG are not articulated clearly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DPs are members of the SAG which meets irregularly according to sector documents (Strategic Plans, MIS Manual, APRs). Although the role of DPs is acknowledged as far as the SAG is concerned, the procedures for their participation are not clear. The arrangements are rather ad hoc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRITERIA</td>
<td>SCORE</td>
<td>SCORE</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Use of information from M&amp;E</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Health sector M&amp;E outputs are not clearly elaborated. Although the NHSP indicates that there shall be monthly, quarterly, semi-annual and annual management reports, it is not clear what comprises (substance) each of these reports. Despite the presence of some of these reports, it is difficult to attest their coherence and consistence with regard to set targets and how the analysis of discrepancies is done. Worse still, these M&amp;E outputs are not generated for specific stakeholders at various levels; instead, they are prepared without regard of the differences in stakeholders’ information needs (typical of one-size-fits-all approach). The agriculture sector M&amp;E produces a number of M&amp;E outputs. Many reports are mentioned in the Strategic Plans under the umbrella of management reports and only identified as monthly, quarterly, semi-annual and annual. The sector also conducts surveys in conjunction with the Central Statistical Office. However, these reports are not prepared to cater for all stakeholders in the sector. For instance, most of them only end up with the sector HQ, meanwhile the districts, communities and other horizontal actors usually have nothing tailored to fit their specific information needs. As revealed by most APRs, the analytical quality of most reports is generally poor. Vague analytical comparisons are made between targets and results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. M&amp;E Outputs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The only mentioned health sector M&amp;E outputs are the APRs. To that extent, it is difficult to ascertain the usability of this information by donors because many of them regard APRs as being too simplistic and lacking analytical depth. Because of this, some donors choose to implement their own uncoordinated systems, ending up further weakening the sector M&amp;E. The arrangements that exist for donors using the sector M&amp;E outputs are rather ad hoc. Only the APRs are shared through the MOF (M&amp;E Department). Although this is so, evidence is not there from the sector documents reviewed (Strategic Plans, APRs, NDPs) on how the information is being integrated into management and policy decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Effective use of M&amp;E by donors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Implicitly, it is mentioned in the NHSPs and NDPs that sector M&amp;E outputs are for informing management decisions as well as policy-making, it remains unclear as to how this was being Results are used for internal purposes but the practice is rather ad hoc. Claims are there in the Strategic Plans that M&amp;E outputs were to be used to inform management decisions and policy influences but no practical example on how this</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
actualized in the health sector. It is not evident (in the MOH key documents) how the MOH HQ has for instance explicitly incorporated M&E information in past management decisions and policy-making. The use is rather ad hoc.

| 33. Effective use of M&E at local level | 1 | There is no evidence in the health sector documents (NHSPs, Health Policy, NDPs, and APRs) were sector M&E outputs were used as instruments for policy-making or advocacy. | 2 | The M&E outputs at local level are used mainly for their information. Through extension officers and radio and TV programmes, farmers use M&E information to make their plans (especially on crops and animal husbandry) as well as engaging the sector on various issues. |

| 34. Effective use of M&E by outside government actors | 1 | No clear evidence is there from the documents about the use of health sector M&E outputs by the actors outside of government. It is not explicitly clear how parliament, CSOs and DPs use the health sector M&E outputs to hold government accountable. Only when there is a scandal like the fraud that occurred in the sector between 2007 and 2008 do these stakeholders rush to check what is in the reports, but even then only scant and uncoordinated information is available. Such inadequate information may not warrant a successful demand by actors outside of government for government accountability. | 2 | The strategic plans and the MIS Manual mentions that the NGOs, CSOs and other actors outside of government access sector M&E reports and incorporate them in their decisions. However, there is only a running commentary about an example in one APR (2009) but all this happens in ad hoc arrangements. Thus, only elements of the use of M&E information by actors outside of government exist. |

Note: Little action (1), Elements exist (2), Action taken (3), Largely developed (4) and Sustainable (5)
### Annex 2: Assessment Checklist for M&E System at Sector Level
*(Source: Holvoet and Inberg, 2011)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Policy</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>M&amp;E plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>M versus E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Autonomy &amp; impartiality (accountability)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Alignment planning &amp; budgeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Methodology</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Selection of indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Quality of indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Disaggregation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Selection criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Priority setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Causality chain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Methodologies used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Data collection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3a. Organisation: structure

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Coordination and oversight</td>
<td>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?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Joint Sector Review</td>
<td>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&amp;E system? Does the JSR promote the reform agenda of the Paris Declaration?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Sector Working groups</td>
<td>Are sector working groups active in monitoring? Is their composition stable? Are various stakeholders represented?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>Does the demand for (strengthening of the) M&amp;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&amp;E system?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Incentives</td>
<td>Are incentives (at central and local level) used to stimulate data collection and data use?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3b. Organisation: linkages

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Linkage with Statistical office</td>
<td>Is there a linkage between sector M&amp;E and the statistical office? Is the role of the statistical office in sector M&amp;E clear?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>‘Horizontal’ integration</td>
<td>Are there M&amp;E units in different sub-sectors and semi-governmental institutions? Are these properly relayed to central sector M&amp;E unit?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>‘Vertical’ upward integration</td>
<td>Is the sector M&amp;E unit properly relayed to the central M&amp;E unit (PRS monitoring system)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>‘Vertical’ downward integration</td>
<td>Are there M&amp;E units at decentralised levels and are these properly relayed to the sector M&amp;E unit?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Link with projects</td>
<td>Is there any effort to relay with/ coordinate with donor M&amp;E mechanism for projects and vertical funds in the sector?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Capacity

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

### 5. Participation of actors outside government

| 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? |

### 6. Use of information from M&E

| 30 | 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 to 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? |
| 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? |
| 34 | Effective use of M&E by outside government actors | Are results of M&E used as an instrument to hold government accountable? |
Annex 3: System used to Identify Scores (on the Bases of LEADS\textsuperscript{14} Method)

(Source: Holvoet and Inberg, 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 M&amp;E plan</td>
<td>No (sections of) M&amp;E plan exist(s).</td>
<td>Only sections of an M&amp;E plan exist, only partly indicating what to evaluate, why, how, for whom.</td>
<td>Different documents describing (parts of) an M&amp;E plan exist, as a result of which it is clear what to evaluate, why, how, for whom. or An M&amp;E plan exists, but not comprehensive, only partly indicating what to evaluate, why, how, for whom (less than three of the four elements).</td>
<td>There is a comprehensive M&amp;E plan, but it does not completely indicate what to evaluate, why, how, for whom (three of the four elements).</td>
<td>A comprehensive M&amp;E plan exists, indicating what to evaluate, why, how, for whom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 M versus E</td>
<td>- The difference and relationship between M and E are not spelled out. - ‘M&amp;E’ is used for both M and E related activities.</td>
<td>- The difference and relationship between M and E are not spelled out. - The two terms are separately used for M and E related activities. or - The difference and/or relationship between M and E are spelled.</td>
<td>- The difference between M and E is clearly spelled out, but the relationship is not. - The two terms are separately used for M and E related activities.</td>
<td>- The difference between M and E is clearly spelled out, the relationship among M and E is also described but not clearly. - The two terms are separately used for M and E related activities.</td>
<td>- The difference and the relationship between M and E are clearly spelled out. - The two terms are separately used for M and E related activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{14}L (Little action), E (Elements exist), A (Action taken), D (Largely developed), S (Sustainable).
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3 | Autonomy & impartiality (accountability) | - The need for autonomy and impartiality is not explicitly mentioned.  
- The M&E plan does not allow tough issues to be analysed.  
- There is no independent budget. | - The need for autonomy and impartiality is explicitly mentioned.  
- The M&E plan does not allow tough issues to be analysed.  
- There is an independent budget.  
or  
- The need for autonomy and impartiality is explicitly mentioned.  
- The M&E plan allows for tough issues to be analysed.  
- There is no independent budget.  
or  
- The need for autonomy and impartiality is explicitly mentioned.  
- The M&E plan allows for tough issues to be analysed.  
- There is an independent budget, but it is very limited (less than 1%). |
| 4 | Feedback | There is no explicit and consistent approach to reporting, dissemination, integration.  
References are made to reporting, dissemination and/or integration, but there is no explicit and consistent approach. | There is an approach to reporting, dissemination, integration, but it is not explicit and consistent.  
There is an explicit approach to reporting, dissemination, integration, but it is not completely consistent.  
or  
There is an explicit and consistent approach to reporting, dissemination, integration. |
| 5 | Alignment of M&E with planning & budgeting | There is no integration of M&E | There is an integration of M&E results in  
There is a more systematic integration | M&E results are systematically
M&E results in planning and budgeting, but it is limited and rather ad hoc. Planning and budgeting, but rather ad hoc.

of M&E results in planning and budgeting, but linkages between M&E, planning and budgeting are not yet institutionalised.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators, data collection and methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>6</strong> Selection of indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| <strong>7</strong> Quality of indicators | - Indicators are not SMART. |
| | - Baselines and targets are not attached (or only baselines or targets). |
| | - (Most of the) indicators are not SMART. |
| | - Baselines or targets are attached. |
| | or |
| | - (Most of the) indicators are SMART. |
| | - Baselines or targets are not attached (to all indicators). |
| | - (Most of the) indicators are SMART. |
| | - Baselines and targets are attached, but not to all indicators. |
| | - Most of the indicators are SMART. |
| | - Baselines and targets are attached. |
| | - All indicators are SMART |
| | - Baselines and targets are attached. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 8    | Disaggregation | - None of the indicators are disaggregated.  
- Some indicators are disaggregated by sex, region, socio-economic status, but not in annual progress reports.  
- Some indicators are disaggregated by sex, region, socio-economic status, also in annual progress reports.  
- Indicators are disaggregated by sex, region, socio-economic status, but not (all of them) in annual progress reports.  
- Indicators are disaggregated by sex, region, socio-economic status, also in annual progress reports. | - None of the indicators are disaggregated.  
- Some indicators are disaggregated by sex, region, socio-economic status, but not in annual progress reports.  
- Some indicators are disaggregated by sex, region, socio-economic status, also in annual progress reports.  
- Indicators are disaggregated by sex, region, socio-economic status, but not (all of them) in annual progress reports.  
- Indicators are disaggregated by sex, region, socio-economic status, also in annual progress reports. | - None of the indicators are disaggregated.  
- Some indicators are disaggregated by sex, region, socio-economic status, but not in annual progress reports.  
- Some indicators are disaggregated by sex, region, socio-economic status, also in annual progress reports.  
- Indicators are disaggregated by sex, region, socio-economic status, but not (all of them) in annual progress reports.  
- Indicators are disaggregated by sex, region, socio-economic status, also in annual progress reports. | - None of the indicators are disaggregated.  
- Some indicators are disaggregated by sex, region, socio-economic status, but not in annual progress reports.  
- Some indicators are disaggregated by sex, region, socio-economic status, also in annual progress reports.  
- Indicators are disaggregated by sex, region, socio-economic status, but not (all of them) in annual progress reports.  
- Indicators are disaggregated by sex, region, socio-economic status, also in annual progress reports. |
| 9    | Selection criteria | - Selection criteria are not clear.  
- It is not clear who was involved in the selection process.  
- The criteria for selection are not clear.  
- It is clear who is involved in the selection process.  
- The criteria for selection are clear.  
- It is clear who is involved in the selection process.  
- Not all relevant data collectors and users are involved in the selection process.  
- The criteria for selection are clear.  
- It is clear who is involved in the selection process.  
- Relevant data collectors and users are involved in the selection process. | - Selection criteria are not clear.  
- It is not clear who was involved in the selection process.  
- The criteria for selection are not clear.  
- It is clear who is involved in the selection process.  
- The criteria for selection are clear.  
- It is clear who is involved in the selection process.  
- Not all relevant data collectors and users are involved in the selection process.  
- The criteria for selection are clear.  
- It is clear who is involved in the selection process.  
- Relevant data collectors and users are involved in the selection process. | - Selection criteria are not clear.  
- It is not clear who was involved in the selection process.  
- The criteria for selection are not clear.  
- It is clear who is involved in the selection process.  
- The criteria for selection are clear.  
- It is clear who is involved in the selection process.  
- Not all relevant data collectors and users are involved in the selection process.  
- The criteria for selection are clear.  
- It is clear who is involved in the selection process.  
- Relevant data collectors and users are involved in the selection process. | - Selection criteria are not clear.  
- It is not clear who was involved in the selection process.  
- The criteria for selection are not clear.  
- It is clear who is involved in the selection process.  
- The criteria for selection are clear.  
- It is clear who is involved in the selection process.  
- Not all relevant data collectors and users are involved in the selection process.  
- The criteria for selection are clear.  
- It is clear who is involved in the selection process.  
- Relevant data collectors and users are involved in the selection process. | - Selection criteria are not clear.  
- It is not clear who was involved in the selection process.  
- The criteria for selection are not clear.  
- It is clear who is involved in the selection process.  
- The criteria for selection are clear.  
- It is clear who is involved in the selection process.  
- Not all relevant data collectors and users are involved in the selection process.  
- The criteria for selection are clear.  
- It is clear who is involved in the selection process.  
- Relevant data collectors and users are involved in the selection process. |
| 10   | Priority setting | - The need to set priorities and limit the number of indicators to be monitored is not acknowledged.  
- The number of indicators is not limited.  
- The need to set priorities and limit the number of indicators to be monitored is acknowledged.  
- The number of indicators is limited.  
- The number of indicators is limited. | - The need to set priorities and limit the number of indicators to be monitored is not acknowledged.  
- The number of indicators is not limited.  
- The need to set priorities and limit the number of indicators to be monitored is acknowledged.  
- The number of indicators is limited.  
- The number of indicators is limited. | - The need to set priorities and limit the number of indicators to be monitored is not acknowledged.  
- The number of indicators is not limited.  
- The need to set priorities and limit the number of indicators to be monitored is acknowledged.  
- The number of indicators is limited.  
- The number of indicators is limited. | - The need to set priorities and limit the number of indicators to be monitored is not acknowledged.  
- The number of indicators is not limited.  
- The need to set priorities and limit the number of indicators to be monitored is acknowledged.  
- The number of indicators is limited.  
- The number of indicators is limited. | - The need to set priorities and limit the number of indicators to be monitored is not acknowledged.  
- The number of indicators is not limited.  
- The need to set priorities and limit the number of indicators to be monitored is acknowledged.  
- The number of indicators is limited.  
- The number of indicators is limited. |
| 11   | Causality chain | Different levels of indicators are not specified.  
- Different levels of indicators are specified, but these are not linked.  
- Different levels of indicators are explicitly linked, but not for all indicators.  
- Different levels of indicators are explicitly linked. | Different levels of indicators are not specified.  
- Different levels of indicators are specified, but these are not linked.  
- Different levels of indicators are explicitly linked, but not for all indicators.  
- Different levels of indicators are explicitly linked. | Different levels of indicators are not specified.  
- Different levels of indicators are specified, but these are not linked.  
- Different levels of indicators are explicitly linked, but not for all indicators.  
- Different levels of indicators are explicitly linked. | Different levels of indicators are not specified.  
- Different levels of indicators are specified, but these are not linked.  
- Different levels of indicators are explicitly linked, but not for all indicators.  
- Different levels of indicators are explicitly linked. | Different levels of indicators are not specified.  
- Different levels of indicators are specified, but these are not linked.  
- Different levels of indicators are explicitly linked, but not for all indicators.  
- Different levels of indicators are explicitly linked. |
| 12   | Methodologies used | - Methodologies are not identified.  
- Methodologies are not mutually integrated.  
- Methodologies are well identified.  
- Methodologies are mutually integrated.  
- Methodologies are well identified.  
- Methodologies are mutually integrated.  
- Methodologies are well identified.  
- Methodologies are mutually integrated and integration is satisfactorily.  | - Methodologies are not identified.  
- Methodologies are not mutually integrated.  
- Methodologies are well identified.  
- Methodologies are mutually integrated.  
- Methodologies are well identified.  
- Methodologies are mutually integrated and integration is satisfactorily. | - Methodologies are not identified.  
- Methodologies are not mutually integrated.  
- Methodologies are well identified.  
- Methodologies are mutually integrated.  
- Methodologies are well identified.  
- Methodologies are mutually integrated and integration is satisfactorily. | - Methodologies are not identified.  
- Methodologies are not mutually integrated.  
- Methodologies are well identified.  
- Methodologies are mutually integrated.  
- Methodologies are well identified.  
- Methodologies are mutually integrated and integration is satisfactorily. | - Methodologies are not identified.  
- Methodologies are not mutually integrated.  
- Methodologies are well identified.  
- Methodologies are mutually integrated and integration is satisfactorily. | - Methodologies are not identified.  
- Methodologies are not mutually integrated.  
- Methodologies are well identified.  
- Methodologies are mutually integrated and integration is satisfactorily. |
| 13 | Data collection | - Sources of data are not identified.  
- Indicators are not linked to sources of data collection. |
|    |                | - Sources of data are identified, but not clearly.  
- Indicators are not linked to sources of data collection. |
|    |                | - Sources of data are clearly identified.  
- Indicators are not linked to sources of data collection. |
|    |                | - Sources of data are clearly identified.  
- Some indicators are linked to sources of data collection. |
|    |                | - Sources of data are clearly identified.  
- All indicators are linked to sources of data collection. |

**Organisation: structure**

| 14 | Coordination and oversight | There is no institutional structure for coordination, support, oversight, analyses of data and feedback at sector level.  
- Different important stakeholders have been left out. |
|    |                | There is an institutional structure for coordination, support, oversight, analyses of data and feedback at sector level.  
- Different important stakeholders have been left out. |
|    |                | - The most important stakeholders are involved. |
|    |                | - Its location is high enough in the ministry’s hierarchy. |
|    |                | - There is an appropriate institutional structure for coordination, support, oversight, analyses of data and feedback at sector level. |
|    |                | - The most important stakeholders are involved. |
|    |                | - Its location is high enough in the ministry’s hierarchy. |
|    |                | - There is an appropriate institutional structure for coordination, support, oversight, analyses of data and feedback at sector level. |
|    |                | - The most important stakeholders are involved. |
|    |                | - Its location is high enough in the ministry’s hierarchy. |

| 15 | Joint Sector Review | JSRs are not taking place.  
- They do not cover accountability and learning needs for both substance and systemic issues.  
- JSRs do not promote the Paris Declaration reform. |
|    |                | JSRs cover accountability and learning needs for both substance and systemic issues, but focus primarily on substance.  
- JSRs are not yet well linked with other M&E tools within the sector M&E system. |
<p>|    |                | JSRs promote the Paris Declaration M&amp;E reform agenda. |
|    |                | JSRs promote the Paris Declaration M&amp;E reform agenda. |
|    |                | - JSRs promote the Paris Declaration M&amp;E reform agenda. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>- They are not linked with other M&amp;E tools within the sector M&amp;E system.</th>
<th>agenda. or - JSRs do not cover accountability and learning needs for both substance and systemic issues. - JSRs are linked with other M&amp;E tools within the sector M&amp;E system and/or - JSRs promote the Paris Declaration M&amp;E reform agenda.</th>
<th>Paris Declaration M&amp;E reform agenda.</th>
<th>Paris Declaration M&amp;E reform agenda.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Sector Working groups</td>
<td>There are no sector working groups. or There are sector working groups, but - They are not active in monitoring. - Their composition is unstable. - Various relevant stakeholders are not represented.</td>
<td>- Sector working groups are not very active in monitoring. - Their composition is stable. - Various stakeholders are represented. or - Sector working groups are active in monitoring. - Their composition is not stable. - Various stakeholders are represented. or - Sector working groups are active in monitoring. - Their composition is not stable. - Various stakeholders are represented.</td>
<td>- Sector working groups are active in monitoring. - Their composition is not stable. - People who left are quickly replaced. - Various stakeholders are represented.</td>
<td>- Sector working groups are active in monitoring. - Their composition is not stable. - People who left are quickly replaced. - Various stakeholders are represented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>- The demand for (strengthening of) the M&amp;E system</td>
<td>- The demand for (strengthening of) the M&amp;E system</td>
<td>- The demand for (strengthening of) the M&amp;E system</td>
<td>- The demand for (strengthening of) the M&amp;E system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Organisation: linkages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Incentives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No incentives are used (at central and local level) to stimulate data collection and data use.</td>
<td>Incentives are used, but not at all levels and not yet effectively to really stimulate data collection and data use.</td>
<td>Incentives are used (at central and local level), but not yet effectively to really stimulate data collection and data use.</td>
<td>Incentives are effectively used to stimulate data collection and data use, but not at all levels.</td>
<td>Incentives are effectively used (at central and local level) to stimulate data collection and data use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Incentives**

- There is a highly placed ‘champion’ within the sector ministry who advocates for the (strengthening of the) M&E system.
- There is a highly placed ‘champion’ within the sector ministry who advocates for the (strengthening of the) M&E system.
- There is a linkage between the sector M&E unit and the statistical office exists. - A linkage between the sector M&E unit and the statistical office exists.
- The role of the statistical office in sector M&E is clear. - The role of the statistical office in sector M&E is clear.
- M&E units in different sub-sectors and semi-governmental institutions are linked with the sector M&E unit, but this link could be stronger.
- M&E units in different sub-sectors and semi-governmental institutions are properly linked with the sector M&E unit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>19</th>
<th>Linkage with Statistical office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- A linkage between the sector M&amp;E unit and the statistical office does not exist. - The role of the statistical office in sector M&amp;E is not clear.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Linkage with Statistical office**

- No linkages between M&E units of sub-sectors with the sector M&E unit |
- M&E units in different sub-sectors and semi-governmental institutions are hardly linked with the sector M&E unit. |
- M&E units in different sub-sectors and semi-governmental institutions are linked with the sector M&E unit, but not properly. |
- M&E units in different sub-sectors and semi-governmental institutions are linked with the sector M&E unit, but this link could be stronger. |
- M&E units in different sub-sectors and semi-governmental institutions are properly linked with the sector M&E unit. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>20</th>
<th>‘Horizontal’ integration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No linkages between M&amp;E units of sub-sectors with the sector M&amp;E unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>21</th>
<th>‘Vertical’ upward integration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No linkages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'Vertical' downward integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No linkages between M&amp;E units at decentralised levels and the sector M&amp;E unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M&amp;E units at decentralised levels are hardly linked with the sector M&amp;E unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M&amp;E units at decentralised levels are linked with the sector M&amp;E unit, but not properly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|   | M&E units at decentralised levels are properly linked with the sector M&E unit. |   | Coordination between sector M&E unit and development partner M&E mechanism for projects and vertical funds in the sector exists and functions but it is not yet institutionalised. | An institutionalised and properly functioning coordination exists between the sector M&E unit and development partner M&E mechanisms for sector projects and vertical funds.

### Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parliament</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The role of Parliament is not recognised</td>
<td></td>
<td>- The role of Parliament is not recognised</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- There is no alignment with Parliamentary control and oversight procedures.</td>
<td></td>
<td>- There is no alignment with Parliamentary control and oversight procedures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Parliament does not participate in JSRs or sector working groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Parliament participates in JSRs and sector working groups.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or</td>
<td></td>
<td>or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The role of Parliament is recognised.</td>
<td></td>
<td>- There is some alignment with Parliamentary control and oversight procedures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- There is no alignment with Parliamentary control and oversight procedures.</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Parliament participates actively in JSRs and sector working groups.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Parliament participates in JSRs and sector working groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td>or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The role of Parliament is recognised.</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Parliament participates actively in JSRs and sector working groups.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- There is alignment with Parliamentary control and oversight procedures.</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Parliament participates actively in JSRs and sector working groups.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Parliament participates actively in JSRs and sector working groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td>or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 28 | Civil Society | - The role of civil society is not recognised.
- There are no procedures for the participation of civil society.
- Participation is not institutionally arranged.
- Civil society does not participate in JSRs or sector working groups.

Or

- The role of civil society is recognised and/or.
- There are clear procedures for the participation of civil society.
- Participation is not institutionally arranged.
- Civil society participates in JSRs and sector working groups.

- The role of Parliament is recognised.
- There is alignment with Parliamentary control and oversight procedures.
- Parliament does not participate in JSRs or sector working groups.

- The role of Parliament is recognised.
- There is alignment with Parliamentary control and oversight procedures.
- Parliament participates in JSRs and sector working groups, but not actively.

- The role of civil society is recognised.
- There are procedures for the participation of civil society, but these are not clear.
- Participation is not institutionally arranged.
- Civil society participates in JSRs and sector working groups.

Or

- The role of civil society is recognised.
- There are clear procedures for the participation of civil society.
- Participation is institutionally arranged.
- Civil society participates actively in JSRs and sector working groups.

- The role of civil society is recognised.
- There are clear procedures for the participation of civil society.
- Participation is institutionally arranged.
- Civil society participates actively in JSRs and sector working groups.

- The role of civil society is recognised.
- There are clear procedures for the participation of civil society.
- Participation is institutionally arranged.
- Civil society participates actively in JSRs and sector working groups.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Civil society</th>
<th>Development partners</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Participates in JSRs and sector working groups, but not actively.</td>
<td>The role of development partners is not recognised.</td>
<td>Participates in JSRs and sector working groups, but not actively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or</td>
<td>The role of development partners is recognised.</td>
<td>The role of development partners is recognised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or</td>
<td>There are no clear procedures for their participation.</td>
<td>There are clear procedures for their participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or</td>
<td>Development partners do not participate in JSRs and sector working groups.</td>
<td>Development partners participate in JSRs and sector working groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or</td>
<td>Development partners participate in JSRs and sector working groups, but not actively.</td>
<td>Development partners participate actively in JSRs and sector working groups.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Use of information from M&E**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M&amp;E outputs</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>There is no presentation of relevant M&amp;E results.</td>
<td>There is a presentation of relevant M&amp;E results.</td>
<td>There is a presentation of relevant M&amp;E results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Results are not compared to targets.</td>
<td>Results are compared to targets.</td>
<td>Results are compared to targets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is no limited analysis of</td>
<td>There is analysis of</td>
<td>There is a presentation of relevant M&amp;E results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Results are compared to targets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There is in-depth analysis of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective use of M&amp;E by development partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- There is no analysis of discrepancies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The M&amp;E output is not differentiated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>towards different audiences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>analysis of discrepancies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The M&amp;E output is not differentiated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>towards different audiences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>discrepancies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The M&amp;E output is not differentiated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>towards different audiences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>discrepancies, but analysis is still weak.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The M&amp;E output is differentiated towards different audiences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- There is a presentation of relevant M&amp;E results.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Results are compared to targets.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- There is in-depth analysis of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>discrepancies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The M&amp;E output is not differentiated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>towards different audiences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Development partners are not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>using the outputs of the sector M&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>system for their information needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The demand for M&amp;E data from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>development partners is not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>coordinated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Development partners are using the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>outputs of the sector M&amp;E system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for their information needs, but</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rather in an ad hoc way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The demand for M&amp;E data from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>development partners is not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>coordinated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Development partners are systematically using the outputs of the sector M&amp;E system for their information needs, but rather in an ad hoc way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The demand for M&amp;E data from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>development partners is not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>coordinated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Development partners are using the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>outputs of the sector M&amp;E system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for their information needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The demand for M&amp;E data from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>development partners is well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>coordinated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Development partners are systematically using the outputs of the sector M&amp;E system for their information needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The demand for M&amp;E data from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>development partners is well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>coordinated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effective use of M&amp;E at central level</th>
<th>Effective use of M&amp;E at local level</th>
<th>sector M&amp;E system for their information needs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Results of M&amp;E activities are not used for internal purposes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Results of M&amp;E activities are used for internal purposes, but rather in an ad hoc way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- It is an instrument of policy-making and/or policy-influencing and advocacy at central level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results of M&amp;E activities are systematically used for internal purposes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- It is an instrument of policy-making, hardly of policy-influencing and advocacy at central level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results of M&amp;E activities are used for internal purposes, but rather ad hoc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- It is an instrument of policy-making and policy-influencing and advocacy at local level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results of M&amp;E activities are systematically used for internal purposes, but use could be more intense.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- It is an instrument of policy-making, policy-influencing and advocacy at local level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective use of M&amp;E at local level</td>
<td>Results of M&amp;E activities are not used for internal purposes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Results of M&amp;E activities are used for internal purposes, but rather in an ad hoc way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- It is an instrument of policy-making, hardly of policy-influencing and advocacy at local level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results of M&amp;E activities are systematically used for internal purposes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- It is an instrument of policy-making, hardly of policy-influencing and advocacy at local level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results of M&amp;E activities are used for internal purposes, but use could be more intense.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- It is an instrument of policy-making and/or policy-influencing and advocacy at local level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Effective use of M&amp;E by outside government actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|----|-------------------------------------------------
|    | Results of M&E are not used as an instrument to hold government accountable. |
|    | Results of M&E are used as an instrument to hold government accountable, but only limitedly and only by a few outside government actors. |
|    | Results of M&E are used as an instrument to hold government accountable by several outside government actors, but use could be more intense. |
|    | Results of M&E are intensively used as an instrument to hold government accountable by several outside government actors. |