

OPEN SPACES TOPICS

Tuesday 2.30 pm	Convener	Topic
1.1	Hubert	To Learn from existing Monitoring tool systems applied by other Countries delegations
1.2	René	Other delegations experience on how to strengthen partner government M &E systems without neglecting EU accountability requirements
1.3	Baptiste	M&E the myth of statistics
1.4	Kjaran	Lessons learned How to create M&E systems which identify lessons that cannot be ignored
1.5	Murray	Is there a conflict or tension between accountability and results? If so, can it be resolved? What does this mean for the indicators?
1.6	Roberto	How to improve the use of projects ROM and Project evaluations through a coordinated approach?

Tuesday 3.30 pm	Convener	Topic
2.1	Serkan	How to conduct sound monitoring on the basis of the appropriate criteria set during the programming phase? How to improve the existing project documents regarding monitoring
2.2	Alain	Quel Ancre Du Monitoring dans les processus d'apprentissage de Capitalisation Au niveau du pays, des projets, de la délégation, de la Commission Européenne
2.3	Baptiste	Monitoring Education System
2.4	Klaus	Are the partner countries willing to provide adequate ly resources for M&E (Experience)
2.5	Wojciech	Is If there is no ideal M&E system is there an ideal format?... and what would it include?
2.6	Arzu	How to structure M&E in HRD sector?

Wednesday 9.30 am	Convener	Topic
3.1	Emmanuelle	From project monitoring to program monitoring: aggregation?
3.2	Arzu	Tools to create a comprehensive M&E system for the needs of all players involved
3.3	Wojciech	What is the problem with monitoring of sector policy
3.4	Pablo	How to make ROM a simple objective and clear tool for better planning both for EU and partner country

Wednesday 10.45 am	Convener	Topic
4.1	Baptiste	Monitoring budget support: why do we always forgot about the budget constraint
4.2	Serkan	Institutional framework for monitoring in the recipient countries / roles & responsibilities
4.3	Balgobin	M&E who need it most you! Me! They! Us! Why?
4.4	Andre	Joint monitoring who is leading? Who is following?
4.5	Daniel	Budget support: Joint annual review experiences & limitations

Topic 1.1

Learn from existing monitoring tools/systems applied by countries/delegations

Main points discussed

- Many similar challenges
- Response should identify SYSTEMS that
 - Simplify monitoring
 - Deals with information overload
 - Better coordination
- Reduce complexity of monitoring by differentiating and categorising (according to aid modalities)
- Tailor-made approach according to circumstances in countries
- Use Delegation monitoring (existing) better:
 - Checklists for internal monitoring
 - Project visits → structure for mission reports
 - Internalise ROM into delegations
- Strengthen government capacity for monitoring
- Strengthen E Commission (Delegation and HQ) capacity for monitoring
- IT solution can be useful but create often problems
- Revise PCM guide
- Use of Log-Frame?

Topic 1.2

Do partner governments need to strengthen its M&E systems?

Main points discussed

What are PG's current M&E systems (+ deficiencies?)

- Stronger PG M&E systems could be useful to strengthen EU accountability (SAME AGENDA: Gov+EU)
- Kaz: M&E “only” for internal purposes / President Administration is overall responsible. Now: Government is developing further its M&E system
- Guyana: Sugar industry - Harmonized/agreed set of indicators between EUD and PG
- Harmonising between different actors/stakeholders
- Clarity of indicators: sources/statistics

Do EUD partners substitute deficient PG M&E systems by their own systems?

- Frictions: different timelines / reporting needs for EU
- EU disbursement pressure

EU perceives PG systems as deficient?

- Solomon Island: Road Map to BS = strengthen PG M&E systems
- BS – frictions: report on disbursement trigger (PG self assessment)

Who (leads) the M&E process in a country? (Sets the agenda?)

- Recommendation to PG: simple lead coordination on M&E
- Recommendation to EUD: let be led
- Joint Matrix
- Government information Systems
- Identify scope for dialogue on M&E in all sectors where cooperation takes place
- “State of play”
- Government + DP/EU M&E systems are interlinked
- EU accountability
- Mali: sharing of EU data with PG

Are donors willing to be coordinated?

Topic 1.3

Statistic: Myth and Reality (and MDG)

Main points discussed?

- Monitoring can be based on statistics with negotiated Indicators
- Starting values for monitoring shall be given together with the methodology behind to understand the rationale behind and how the values were obtained
- Monitoring should depict time trends of standardized values instead of giving absolute values
- Indicators should be derived for specific purposes, even if impact indicators are difficult to be defined
- such indicators should be a tool to facilitate the dialogue between donors and PGs on specific policy issues in particular in the context of budgetary aid
- Triangulation can involve the civil society and the academic environment and thus increase the liability, transparency and robustness of indicators
- Poverty reduction strategies as an example: they did develop a set of indicators to monitor poverty reduction over time and have thereby facilitated a respective dialogue and also facilitated the involvement of civil society in the dialogue
- ROM does not have enough resources and time for being effective in the context of budgetary aid

Further comments:

- Bottom up approaches show losses of preciseness but this can be overcome with statistical methods
- EC Delegations do not have enough expertise on statistical methods.
- Best Practice: PG Mali dedicated substantial resources to build and improve their statistics and the data is now more reliable
- There should be a country system in place (compare Mali)
- Decision making -> stat. And political dialogue, question the stat. Dialogue
- To make informed decisions it is important to know how big is the margin of error of the statistics
- When the disbursement depends on certain indicators, this might be an incentive to manipulate data
- Budgetary aid may be an incentive to improve statistics

Topic 1.4

How to make M&E systems identify lessons which cannot be ignored?

Main points discussed

- Political priorities could overrule lessons learned

Case: court of Auditors

- ➔ Too easy to ignore such advice/lessons learned as stand alone

Sector evaluation of Rule of Law

Assistance under CARDS very critical but still political pressure

- How to overcome this endless process of repeating past mistakes?
- How to take pre-conditions (readiness, institutional/legal framework etc)?
- RAC/RAL pressures changes judgement of DEL /Beneficiary
- NOT government money so less commitment? Need bonus for beneficiary/Staff for successful projects?

Topic 1.5

Is there a tension between monitoring for accountability and for results? If so can it be resolved? What are the implications for indicators?

Main points discussed?

The discussion began with different meanings of accountability. For projects financial accountability meant following the PRAG, (which was being updated quite often and was burdensome for delegations) and audit, while the Delegation and ROM were monitoring activities and results including outputs, and results. For Budget Support, indicators on results in terms of outcomes were important since they could determine whether the tranches were disbursed.

Several examples of budget support were discussed. In one case budget support was linked to the payment of salaries for teachers so that there was a link between activities and the disbursement. In another case, the disbursement of education support was linked to achieving different indicators such as improving the pass rate and reducing absenteeism among disadvantaged students. In this case the indicators were inconsistent with some improving and some deteriorating. Since the target indicators all needed to be improved, the funds for the variable tranche were not disbursed. A small decrease in one indicator of results was enough to stop the funding. It was noted that including results indicators such as more sustainable building did lead to changes in behaviour. The reporting on budget support including macroeconomic stability was burdensome.

There was some discussion of Log Frame analysis. Some felt the tool was useful but that it was not properly used or that there was not enough focus on the details. The indicators at the outset would be vague and they would not be refined after approval of the project or budget support.

There was also a discussion of risks. Either for financial accountability or for achieving results there was an emphasis on minimising risks. Yet a portfolio with no risk was not likely to be the best for achieving development objectives.

The suggestion was made that the Commission could provide more technical assistance and support for the design and implementation of budget support. The multilateral development banks had similar conditions for loans but they provided more assistance and support for meeting the conditions.

There also could be more sharing of experience about the challenges on managing and implementing budget support. Both delegations and Partner governments could benefit from the sharing of experience.

Topic 1.6

How to improve the use of project ROM and evaluations through a coordinated approach

Main points discussed?

1) Use of ROM

- Explain the ROM process including the pedagogical side, to have more collaboration on ROM process with NAO PG
- Ownership of results (recommendations if briefings are well done – moderated if need be)
- Capitalize on ROM lessons learnt

2) Follow-up of ROM

- Sometimes recommendations not practical (e.g. if need change financing agreement)
- Should set up a system of follow-up systematic of recommendations, with corrective actions to be taken if needed – Have regular meetings on recommendations

3) ROM Philosophy

- Insist on transparency & timelines
- Have a more attentive ear to beneficiary governments
- Make information more accessible

4) Joint Monitoring = WORKING TOGETHER

5) Use of ROM at different levels:

1. Project level for better implementation
2. Programming: capitalising on ROM Results!

Topic 2.1

How to conduct sound monitoring on the basis of the appropriate criteria set during the programming phase? How to improve the existing project documents regarding monitoring?

Main points discussed?

Turkey, DRC and Kazakhstan are discussed as case studies. Programming responsibility is jointly in Turkey and Kazakhstan cases. In DRC it is the NAO office responsibility. Monitoring responsibility is jointly reviewed out in RDC.

In Kazakhstan there is only ROM as source of monitoring.

Programme level indicators are developed with the help of sector documents and government documents. Extended studies about programme level indicators are not government owned.

How do improve indicators?

- Setting common indicators for the same sector for all donors involved
- Using government indicators as much as possible
- Conduction of necessary sector context analysis of the current situation
- Take into account lessons learned
- Government owned M&E system
- Commonly developed and used M&E system
- Joint missions for monitoring visits

Other ideas raised were

- ROM can be part of JMON
- Revision of indicators during implementation

Topic 2.2

Ancrage du Rom dans le processus d'apprentissage et de capitalisation au niveau : (i) des pays, (ii) des projets, (iii) des DUE et (iv) de la Commission Européenne.

Main points discussed?

Les débats ont porté plus spécifiquement sur le ROM des projets et non sur les outils permettant le monitoring des approches sectorielles et des appuis budgétaires.

La nécessité de clairement définir les termes utilisés (Jrom, ROM interne, Rom externe etc.) a été soulignée par l'ensemble des participants.

Le manque de capitalisation et de communication sur les résultats obtenus depuis plusieurs années sur l'EROM a été déploré. Une plus grande publicité pourrait être donnée aux rapports de monitoring. Il conviendra cependant d'être bien conscient du danger potentiel de diffuser les rapports auprès de personnes qui pourraient les utiliser pour discréditer l'ensemble de l'aide publique au développement de l'UE.

Il a été vivement souhaité de communiquer spécifiquement sur les bonnes pratiques et les projets qui fonctionnent très bien afin d'améliorer la visibilité des actions de l'UE. Des supports audiovisuels pourraient être diffusés sous la maîtrise d'ouvrage des différentes délégations à travers le monde.

Les participants ont souhaité qu'il y ait une meilleure valorisation des compétences locales lors des missions EROM. Le cas du ROM national du Mali a été

Beaucoup de critiques ont été formulées à l'encontre du ROM externe et plus spécifiquement à l'endroit des moniteurs dont les compétences ont été mise en cause par les DUE. La qualité de l'outil n'a par contre pas été critiquée.

Au Maroc où 70% de l'aide passe par de l'appui budgétaire, le EROM pourrait très utilement se concentrer sur le suivi des « petits projets » et plus spécifiquement sur les projets ONG avec une vraie valeur ajoutée.

Topic 2.3

Monitoring Education System

Main points discussed?

→ Kosovo: not allowed for GBS. Primary / secondary / vocational

- Feasibility study for SPSP approach
- All consultants have different views
- Ready for Pool fund (reduce transaction costs)
- Data exists (including drop out rate)

→ Teachers having lack of skill / curriculum update

- need for them to be certified
- Curriculum update: more than one shift for each school
- Morning/afternoon/evening shift
- The National curriculum defines the learning outcome
- Teachers have more than one job

→ Problem with the perception of education vocational

→ Problem to link the different systems

→ Problem to link education system and job creation

→ Old Yugoslav curricula

Topic 2.4

Are partners governments willing (be able) to adequately provide resources for M&E?

Main points discussed

Discussion without a representatives from PGs

Main obstacle:

- Scarce resources in quality and quantity (lack of resources) on both sides (delegation + partner governments)
- Lack of quality also in partner governments / delegation desk offices have sometimes 30 projects to follow
- Finally the lack of follow-up frustrates PG
- Joint Monitoring does not lead to Joint Management
- Willingness also depends on the relative importance of aid to GPD
- Willingness may increase with increased harmonization (alignment of systems)→Nobody, no donor has ROM like EU
- ROM on budget support? NO information disseminated on this!
- No good marketing/good use of ROM→People involved do not know how to access

Topic 2.5

If there's no ideal M&E system, is there a “Magic” M&E format?

Main points discussed

- A simple answer is no, no “magic” format as the question was a rhetorical one
- The picture is varied – formats used so far depend on aid modalities, some PG are interested to find out more about ROM format (e.g. El Salvador)
- All agree that Joint M&E has to be led by PGs (sometimes PG-EU cooperation on M&E can push other donors in the same direction, e.g. as in the Solomon Islands)
- If there is no capacity on the part of PG, Joint M&E does not fly (e.g. DRC)
- The imbalance of resources for M&E between donors and PGs is an obstacle for joint approach

Joint approach should start from meetings (regular) on National Development Strategy, and then be followed by joint meetings and M&E on sector policies (can donors/EU accept own M&E of e.g. NGOs?)

Topic 2.6

How to structure M&E process in HRD sector

Main points discussed

- Two levels of analysis
 - Monitoring of projects – also for the payment validation
 - Program monitoring
- Data collection and unit of analysis to be used should be carefully studied, reflect the status of final participants / recipients
- Indicators to be identified with national authorities but in terms of impact it is difficult to measure
- Try to sensitise all level (beneficiaries, governments, donors) on the importance of a structured framework for M&E
- Ask for technical assistance from the EU/Development Partner on the lessons learnt when implementing M1E in other countries – Sharing knowledge
- Project level meeting indicators may be a success but at program level, introducing a change in term of culture is difficult

Topic 3.1

From project monitoring to programme monitoring aggregation?

Main points discussed?

- Who is responsible for programme monitoring?
- Approach of working group to monitor programme
- What are we looking at while monitoring project and programme: is an impact of a project contributing to result of programme
- In budget support, joint monitoring to include other donors – Importance of coordinating donors
- Either set up a comprehensive monitoring system bottom-up or in depth macro-analysis every years top down, combined
- Question of data collection
- Aggregation could be done though simplified core element. This will positive for transparency.
- Importance of well designing projects to allow sound monitoring – Necessity to define indicators also at programme level + importance of intervention logic
- Monitoring is more about management, hence at project level
- The logical framework should be used in a more flexible way
- When aggregate data, problem of data quality
- Governance plays have a key role
- Issue of retain in national administration

Topic 3.2

Tools to create a comprehensive M&E System for the needs of all players involved

Main points discussed?

- Actors involved in Joint monitoring activities may differ for each country-donors, government, EU Civil society, are active players in general terms
 - Monitoring activities are clustered in line with the instruments applicable (Ie budgetary support)
 - Definition and framework for joint monitoring require further clarification in terms of roles of the government, EU and other relevant parties
- Whether going on a visit “Together/jointly” & “Preparing the report” with all parties involved is a question to be discussed and agreed
- Lesson learnt should be structured as tool that feeds into monitoring
 - A single authority to be assigned for the coordination of monitoring activities and follow up actions however it is notable that line ministries are individually responsible for the follow up of actions recommended
 - As the complexity of the case one single system cannot be applicable but rather a more generic approach can be adopted
 - Monitoring at programming level is crucial to get the priorities set at the very beginning Complexity can be structured at different layers/ levels and the input can be regulated in respect to these levels
 - Under budgetary support, donor coordination, alignment with national strategies, structuring a framework to cover all donor priorities and monitoring system are considered major elements to mainstream for effective funds management
 - Mission report should rather look like a mini-monitoring and to run a joint monitoring is required with the delegations and government rather to be organised in a manner of counterpart- with a similar approach , learn about common tools.
 - Careful with what data you ask for: better be realistic and simple as possible as if the data is complex and difficult to analyse, it is useless.

Topic 3.3

What is the problem with Joint Monitoring of sector policy?

Main points discussed?

- Sector policy is owned by PG; EU Support is on the periphery of the national policy: setting up dialogue may prove very difficult
- Monitoring timeframe of the EU is a hindrance; It is unrealistic to review indicators every 6 months
- Defining indicators is key: EU has to show some flexibility in this area (particularly the HQ)
- Monitoring cooperation comes in two forms:
 - 1) When GBS or SBS is involved
 - 2) When they are not
- External monitoring has its limitations in the sector policy monitoring; This has to be constant, Long term; not adhoc
- Some donors exert pressure on PG to influence sector policy according to their objectives (some EU line DGs actually compete to each other)
- EU has to limit its ambition on indicators, has to be realistic, the indicators have to be realistic
- Important to base the dialogue on political analysis

Topic 3.4

How to improve ROM for EC & PG

Main points discussed?

- Weaknesses of ROM
 - Visits too short
 - Quality not enough
 - Recommendations are not realistic
 - Monitor not always satisfactory
 - Government (RDC) does not receive reports so they argue about the usefulness
- Strengths
 - Methodology rigorous and consistent
 - Externality value added
- Format of ROM
 - Not very well known by PG's and needs to be better disseminated
 - ROM reports are not always distributed to PGs
 - They must be distributed to all stakeholders without discretion and timely
 - More flexibility on ROM missions according to local circumstances (not concentrated at the same time)
 - Clear and realistic recommendations
- Extract lessons learnt through a process and distribute them to all interested parties
- MALI uses the ROM for internal monitoring
- MADAGASCAR use the same format for internal monitoring
- ➔ It could be used we need training for local personnel in order to have it implemented
- Quality of ROM monitors unequal
- Often MR not satisfactory but they come back!
- Quality control through the feedback RS
- How can JM be implemented? (It is worth when amounts are important)
- ➔ Ownership: It depends so on local responses HHRR capacities
- MTR ->
 - RDC-> done by delegation with external support
 - Mauritius ---by delegation, no joint exercise
 - M...-> no MTR
 - BF -> Lead by PG with external expert and EC DEL
 - KAZ -> MTR done in 2009 -> mission by RELEX did it not joint (no joint Agenda etc) but EuropeAID marginal
- Consequences of ROM on logical framework
 - Change of indicators if fully justified but careful on resources allocation consequences
- Joint Monitoring as source for changing allocation and resources in EDF, FA and contracts

Topic 4.1

Monitoring Budget Support / What about the budget constraint

Main points discussed?

Maurice → budget 7 Meuros (1.2 M d`hab)

ABG 30 Meuros via FED + sucre

4eme année d"ABG

1 ROM with ABG but was cancelled

ES → SPSP method not that good → can get up to 50 man/day

Maurice :

- PBB: indicators within the budget
- No budget constraint / can barrow a domestic market
- If not possible then how is it possible to use GBS
- Most of countries have no real budget constraint so no relevant set up indicators
- Not really good monitoring for budget support

SPSP is supported by policy matrix with reviews → there is enough missions?

Administrative data quality is an issue

As well as having access to information

A lot of thing depends on the context

If you want to understand the result then you need to understand the process → delegation and monitoring do not focus enough on process → this create confusion

Problem is the quality of the dialogue → because the dialogue in the policy are process oriented

Topic 4.2

Institutional Framework for Monitoring in the recipient countries/roles and responsibilities

Main points discussed?

Different structures of some countries (Turkey, Syria, DRC, etc.) in line with the operational modes such as DIs, Budgetary support were discussed. In this context:

- No single M&E system applicable for all countries
- Culture of M&E to be introduced and adapted by the beneficiary institutions willingness of relevant parties for joint monitoring is crucial

General understanding and consensus required for effective Monitoring

- National /government monitoring system as the system of the development partners can be structured in a similar manner, i.e. as basis of ROM to reduce transaction costs
- ROM is a tool that can be used – but not have to be used- if/when there is no need for external assessment
- Organisation of ROM Mission with the participation of external evaluators and DEL/Partner governments needs justification – this is not the way forward purpose rather be considered carefully
- The system is too complex to easily define” Joint” as term . Joint may can come at different levels as the practical requirements are concerned.

Workshop on Joint Monitoring 12-15 October 2010, Brussels
 “Co-creating the future of Joint Monitoring – challenges and opportunities”

Topic 4.3				
M&E Who needs it most? you-me-they-us-why – how –when -where				
Main points discussed?				
	Country	Donors	NGO	Us (NGO, Business, Donor, ...)
Why	Measure Projects/Programmes Measure Budget support targets/indicators	Budget Programme Public expenditure Guidance to Public Policies formulation	Harmonise Investments Integrate Projects/Programmes Avoid duplication of efforts Measure Impact/assistance	Value for money Impact on growth
How	M&E system: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Objective - Subjective Assessment of Country Performance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Analytical - Subject 	National develop. Strategy PRSP (Country Strategy) Sector Strategy PSP	Individual assessment Joint assessment Donor/Country integration	Joint assessment Public consultaion
When	½ - 1- multiyear	Monthly 1/2Yr Annual report Multi yr reporting	½ Year Annual Multi year	Anytime
Where	Country level (DEL) HQ (Brussels)	Dept/Ministries Sectors Budget	Sector level National level Political/policy level	Public debate Publications/Press etc

Topic 4.4

Who is leading, who is following?

Main points discussed?

Répartition des rôles :

Existence de pré-requis pour envisager J-ROM

- Diagnostic des capacités (effectif, niveau,...)
- Diagnostic de l'ownership/réceptivité (JROM importe = JROM imposé ?)
- JROM: gestion bicéphale / déduction commune impossible
- Mais, analyse commune à promouvoir
- Si volonté gouvernementale pour le ROM, faciliter l'apprentissage (...) sur base du modèle CE, en laissant le gouvernement reformuler les questionnaires au besoin et traduire dans les langues nationales, si utile
- Distinction ROM national pour les projets a dominante technique

ROM externe

- pour les projets a dominante institutionnelle ou a impact politique « délicat »
- Les suspicious
- Les cas de mauvaise foi

Topic 4.5

Budget Support – Joint Annual Reviews, Experience + limitations

Main points discussed? Short and simple description, please

(if you have more than one page, please give them consecutive page numbers).

JAR is a very useful exercise for DEC+PG, even though it is a HQ reporting requirement.

Beginning of the year a roughly 30 page report covering all activities of PG-EC cooperatives. (Ethiopia)

(merge with BS group)

Ghana: If you take monitoring of BS seriously you need to follow as closely/detailed as possible. To be result-oriented you need to have followed the process.

In middle income countries there are so many BS related monitoring/reviews/reporting mechanisms that no additional activity is needed.

Major challenge: Administrative data/statistics