

HARMONIZATION & ALIGNMENT







MAIN QUESTIONS



- Should the government establish it own monitoring system?
- Is Joint Monitoring an obligation or a recommendation?
- How can the different tools be complementary and not duplicating each other?
- Should all stakeholders share the same system and tools?







FINDINGS

- To increase harmonization through alignment is a shared objective by donors and PGs
- The adaptation to local environment should be the primary step
- The institutionalization of M&E should be led by PGs
- The National Development Strategy is the common framework for any M&E exercise







FINDINGS

- It is still difficult to have common M&E because many donors have different requirements
- Almost all PGs have in place some system of monitoring and evaluation although the quality and the capacity are different and sometimes not satisfactory
- The establish an efficient system of M&E is a long term process and it is not advisable to expect short term results and efficiency







SOME SUGGESTIONS

- In the project-programme identification / design phase the assessment of the local capacities for M&E MUSTINGED be a decisive part of the analysis
- It should develop then some sort of validation process for the local capacities to be shared by all involved stakeholders
- In case the assessment finds that there is a need of "capacity building" for M&E specific resources should be allocated for it and for harmonization
- In this case "real" Joint Monitoring as working together could be used as "learning by doing" action







FUTURE TRENDS

- In the future JMON or full alignment with location capacities could substitute the external ROM in most of the cases
- The external ROM should be used for special cases when PG and EU Del are aware of specific problems in the management or in case of special cases for better lessons learnt





