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Since the 1990’s, OPEV has partnered with others to support Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) capacity development of RMCs through a variety of advocacy and knowledge sharing activities. With the initiation of the Poverty Reduction Strategy approach and other Harmonization, Coordination and results-based management initiatives, the need for M&E has increased limitations in M&E capacity.

Consequently, OPEV initiated a M&E training needs assessment related to Regional Member Countries (RMCs) Poverty Reduction Strategies and Program (PRSP) implementation in order to design a feasible and relevant training program. The study was to identify and propose specific areas of training programs, for which the Bank Group has a comparative advantage to design, organize and implement.

The study used a mix of methods to assess the current training needs: a literature review and site visits to Tanzania, Mozambique, and Uganda; email surveys of ADB country economists, ADB county representatives, and RMC representatives; and key informant interviews.

The review has concluded that there is a need to broaden the traditional M&E topics and combine process, organizational and institutional building knowledge and skills with technical subject matter. Best practices in adult learning and education demand hands-on applications, participatory methods, relevance to learner needs at the right skill level: beginning, intermediate, advanced. Explicit attention needs to be paid to ways in which training can effectively facilitate greater transfer and application of learning.

Furthermore, there is need for collaboration and coordination in provision of M&E training among donors and also within the different units of the Bank in charge of capacity building (PDRE, ADI, and JAI). The variety of ad hoc courses, fragmentation of offerings, redundancy in learning resources that are available, extent of demand, and continued weaknesses in national M&E capacity all speak to the need for greater coordination and coherency in M&E training and capacity development.

The scope and intent of a Bank Group training strategy depends upon institutional priorities, resources, responsibilities and capacities. A long-term training plan, aligned with other donor plans, would provide the vision and goals for strategy implementation. For any strategy, key attributes include customization, pedagogical quality, transfer of learning, program sustainability and coordination with other donors. It is also expected that any training intervention would be done in collaboration with relevant local entities, e.g., AfrEA, national evaluation associations, local training and research institutes.

This report is submitted to CODE for information.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. Study Objective and Methodology

1.1 Since the 1990’s, OPEV has partnered with others to support Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) capacity development of RMCs through a variety of advocacy and knowledge sharing activities. With the initiation of the PRS approach and other results-based management initiatives, the need for M&E has increased limitations in M&E capacity. Consequently, OPEV initiated a M&E training needs assessment related to RMC PRSP implementation in order to design a feasible and relevant training program of support.

1.2 The assessment used a mix of methods to understand current training needs that included a desk review; site visits to Tanzania, Mozambique, and Uganda; email surveys of ADB country economists, ADB county representatives, and RMC representatives; and key informant interviews.

2. Main Findings

2.1 Activity and people involved in PRSP M&E vary by country and level of PRSP implementation. PRSP-II countries have the most experience to share and are modifying their M&E systems based on this experience. Countries often have a central unit and a series of technical working groups at the national level. Below the national level, multiple layers are involved with individuals, committees and/or units carrying M&E roles and responsibilities: sector ministries; administrative levels (central, regional, district, community); project and service delivery levels.

2.2 Some training needs and demands are similar at all levels/across all responsibilities; other training needs are specific to a given level, responsibility or sector. Few involved in PRSP M&E have received training. More attention has been given to training national level staffs. Increasing attention is being paid to capacities needed to promote authentic and meaningful civil society participation. Less attention has been paid to the middle levels in the ministerial and administrative systems.

2.3 No two PRSP M&E systems are alike. Each country context and process, resulting PRSP and M&E system, is unique. Not only is each different, but each is evolving according to its own circumstances. Results-based management is relatively new and donor procedures and expectations also are evolving. M&E and M&E training needs might be considered a “moving target”.

2.4 There is high demand for people to fill M&E responsibilities, conduct research, and provide training. All the major donors are involved in a variety of training and support initiatives. The African Evaluation Association (www.afrea.org) offers a robust web site and country professional evaluation associations.

2.5 Ten priority issues were identified as gaps, representing a number of training needs: (1) coordination of processes and procedures across the many groups, systems, levels, partners and
donors; (2) utilization of M&E data in decision making including analytical capabilities; (3) practical, targeted performance indicators that are realistic and meaningful to measure; (4) measurement and data collection that provide timely, useful data; (5) leadership commitment and valuing of M&E; (6) civil society participation and stakeholder participation; (7) common understanding of M&E in RBM; (8) methods and practice of evaluation; (9) methods and practice of monitoring; (10) planning capacity as prerequisite for M&E.

2.6 From a list of potential M&E training topics, study respondents most frequently selected Building a monitoring and evaluation system for results-based accountability. Other frequently selected topics included Performance Indicators, Use of M&E Information and Engaging stakeholders/civil society participation.

2.7 All data support the importance of hands-on application, experiential learning, participatory methods, opportunities to share and network with others, and grounding any training in country realities. Lack of transfer and application of training content to actual country work is a common problem, resulting in too little benefit from training for the country and work environment.

3. Conclusions and Recommendations

3.1 M&E training needs are broad and deep. The number of individuals and variety of activities involved in building and sustaining national PRSP M&E systems are vast. A certain level of capacity is necessary at each level if quality data are to flow and be utilized at the level where decision making is relevant. Training needs relate to institutional, organizational, information as well as human capacity development.

3.2 Given the different stages of PRSP and M&E development, unique country contexts and differing role, responsibilities and players in M&E, customized training programs are essential. There is no “best-practice” model, set sequence of steps or activities, or “one shoe fits all.” It will be important to design flexible training assistance, incremental approaches, be able to capitalize on “windows of opportunity” and provide for “just-in-time-learning.”

3.3 This study began to identify individuals, groups and countries actively involved in PRSP M&E implementation. More work is needed to further clarify key audiences with contact names and responsibilities and to continually assess their needs in the context of PRSP evolution. There is a need to move beyond training for individuals as the audience and consider the training audience as teams or groups (e.g., teams of high level officials; country teams (ADB and country partners); M&E working groups; sectors) as well as whole institutions (country-level). Assessment of readiness will help to utilize limited training resources more effectively.

3.4 Increased targeting of training will enhance learning outcomes. A number of options exist including greater focus and targeting by content, audience and/or country.

3.5 There is a need to broaden the traditional M&E topics and combine process, organizational and institutional building knowledge and skills with technical subject matter. Best practices in adult learning and education demand hands-on applications, participatory
methods, relevance to learner needs at the right skill level: beginning, intermediate, advanced. Explicit attention needs to be paid to ways in which training can effectively facilitate greater transfer and application of learning.

3.6 The need for collaboration and coordination in provision of M&E training is evident. The variety of ad hoc courses, fragmentation of offerings, redundancy in learning resources that are available, extent of demand, and continued weaknesses in national M&E capacity all speak to the need for greater coordination and coherency in M&E training and capacity development.

3.7 **Specific Areas of Training Programs**

a. A draft design for a one week workshop is developed that combines content for results-based management and indicator development with focus on practical learning and transfer of content. The proposed curriculum provides a feasible, focused module based on expressed needs that could be implemented and converted into a learning resource for ongoing use.

b. Design and implement a training program for ADB staff in M&E who are involved in CSP design and implementation so that they can more effectively support their RMC partners, both in terms of PRSP M&E and CSP M&E. Experience shows the interdependencies that exist between the quality of an organization’s M&E and ability of the client to conduct and utilize M&E.

c. Target the “suppliers” who deliver RMC M&E training and support, i.e, local training and research institutes, local consultants, and NGOs with training and support. For example,

   i. a training program designed and implemented by ADB to “train the trainer”;
   ii. ADB support to individuals who wish to attend/participate in other M&E training programs (e.g., IPDET);
   iii. ADB support to local training programs that target RMC M&E needs;
   iv. ADB support for skill building professional development workshops offered in conjunction with the AfrEA Conference.

d. Identify and/or develop and make readily available simple and practical learning materials relevant for country staff working in PRSP M&E and to be used by other trainers across the continent to promote and extend the M&E culture.

3.8 **Other Capacity Building Options**

a. Support scholarships, sponsorships, funding to other target groups:

   i. AfrEA: support to strengthen association; to build member capacity; to implement activities that advance African M&E capacity
   ii. Country/national evaluation associations: support to strengthen association; to build member capacity; to implement activities
   iii. African evaluators: individual scholarships, training funds for professional development
iv. University programs: fund University programs that train government staff; that train and prepare university students, including graduate programs, short courses, seminars
v. Local consultants and private sector organizations involved in or capable of providing M&E

b. Support joint efforts; for example,
i. Joint evaluation capacity development projects of African trainers, evaluators, institutions (similar to joint evaluation projects)
ii. Partnerships between ADB and selected RMCs to develop M&E capacity
iii. Networking and cross-country collaboration
iv. Donor coordination and collaboration in M&E training and ECD

c. Other financial supports
i. RMC-led country evaluations
ii. Cross-country visits; sharing; study tours
iii. Pairing arrangements between governments to share and learn together
iv. Twinning arrangements that pair a country with a specialized professional evaluation institute for in-country ECD
v. Long-term/short-term technical assistance personnel

3.9 Single-shot training rarely is cost-effective. Attention needs to be paid to ways in which training programs and learning resources can be reused, repurposed and embedded in a system of wider institutional and organizational capacity development. If the desired end result of training is to improve practice and change behaviors of individuals, groups and institutions, then training programs need to connect to a range of supports (technical assistance, ongoing mentoring, follow-up activities, networking) in a coherent way that will facilitate achievement of the desired outcomes.

3.10 The issues facing current PRSP M&E point to a compendium of training needs. Training is a core and necessary component of evaluation capacity development. The demand for training is large and growing. The scope and intent of a Bank Group training strategy depends upon institutional priorities, resources, responsibilities and capacities. A long-term training plan, aligned with other donor plans, would provide the vision and goals for strategy implementation. For any strategy, key attributes include customization, pedagogical quality, transfer of learning, program sustainability and coordination with other donors. It is also expected that any training intervention would be done in collaboration with relevant local entities, e.g., AfrEA, national evaluation associations, local training and research institutes.
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) are key to public sector reform. With the move to results-based management, M&E has gained renewed vigor as a way to enhance sound governance by providing input into government decision making including the budget process. M&E serves management by providing information to support evidence-based policy discussions and for understanding performance, critical for learning, planning and improving. It contributes to public sector accountability by putting in place the mechanisms for holding managers and governments accountable for performance.

1.2 M&E is fundamental to the successful implementation of the Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRS) approach. It is intended to provide the means for supporting evidence-based policy decisions, for evaluating development effectiveness and for making adjustments in implementation as needed. A recent review of the PRS approach by the World Bank and International Monetary Fund (September 2005) underscores the centrality of a strong M&E system for enhancing development effectiveness, reinforcing mutual accountabilities and realizing the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

1.3 The Operations Evaluation Department (OPEV), is responsible for conducting relevant, independent evaluation as well as building M&E capacity within Regional Member Countries (RMCs). Since the 1990’s, OPEV has partnered with others to support M&E capacity development of RMCs through a variety of advocacy and knowledge sharing activities. With the initiation of the PRS approach and other results-based management initiatives, the need for M&E has gained even greater import. Lessons learned and recommendations at the end of the ADB-sponsored activities as well as other findings reveal the serious constraints and limited M&E capacities in RMCs and, therefore, the need for effective M&E capacity development.

1.4 Consequently, in 2005, OPEV collaborated with the Joint Africa Institute (JAI), the Public Service Commission of South Africa and the IPDET training team to implement a week-long development evaluation seminar in Tunis for 43 high-level national RMC staff. Continued collaboration with JAI in training provision is intended for 2006. In order to design a demand-driven training initiative, OPEV initiated a needs assessment study to determine actual demand as it exists on the ground.

2. STUDY OBJECTIVE AND METHODOLOGY

2.1 Objective

The purpose of the study was to conduct a M&E training needs assessment in RMCs related to the implementation of their PRSPs. The study was to “...identify and propose specific areas of training programmes, for which the Bank Group has a comparative advantage (to design, organize and implement).”
2.2 Methodology

2.2.1 The study used a mix of methods to understand current training needs:

2.2.1.1 Desk review: The literature review included three main areas of information: (1) that related to African country poverty reduction strategies: individual country Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) and Joint Staff Reviews; World Bank, ADB and other donor reports and case studies; (2) evaluation capacity building literature: donor community, professional associations and academic literature (the larger capacity building literature was reviewed but the primary focus for this study was the evaluation capacity building literature); and (3) training literature, particularly experience and best practices in development evaluation training programs.

2.2.1.2 Site visits: In December 2005, the Review Team conducted site visits in RMCs in order to gain information “on actual demand that exists on the ground” and to “share the views of the various stakeholders involved in M&E, with particular focus on PRSP monitoring”. Tanzania, Mozambique, and Uganda were selected for site visits because they represented a higher level of PRSP and M&E implementation providing greater opportunity to discuss issues and training needs with key stakeholders. Eight to nine interviews were conducted in each country with a total of 25 individuals representing national secretariats, ministries, national statistics office, civil society, research and consulting communities, and donors.

2.2.2 A set of interview questions guided the discussions in each country. Core questions included:

- What is the institutional arrangement, processes and mechanisms of M&E as related to the PRSP?
- Who is involved, at what levels, what are their roles/responsibilities, capacities?
- What are the gaps/needs in M&E performance that could be addressed through training?
- What are other donors, organizations doing or planning regarding M&E training?
- What local resources (training institutes, research/academic/NGOs) are involved or might be partners with ADB in M&E training?

2.2.2.1 Email survey: An email survey provided standardized information from a larger group of respondents: ADB country economists, ADB country representatives, and RMC representatives. The questionnaire (Annex 2) focused specifically on training needs; question wording was informed by what was learned during the desk review and site visits. A total of 32 responses were compiled: 19 ADB economists, 2 ADB country representatives; 11 RMCs (see Annex 3 for survey response information; Annex 4 for selected survey results).
2.2.2.2 **Key informant interviews:** Other key interviews were conducted with relevant ADB staff including OPEV staff, country economists for PRSP countries, POPR, and ADI and key others (JAI, World Bank, African evaluators).

3. **CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS**

3.1 Because language often gets in the way of understanding, key terms and meanings used in this report are presented first. Even the term “evaluation” often means different things to different people. The OECD monitoring and evaluation glossary serves as the principal guide with amplifications provided as needed.

3.2 **Monitoring:** the regular tracking of inputs, outputs, outcomes and impacts of development activities at the project, program, sector and/or national levels. In the PRSP context, Bedi et al (2005) differentiate three types of monitoring:

- **Poverty monitoring** that tracks impact indicators against national targets; measured periodically through censuses and surveys; usually led by the national statistics office.
- **Implementation monitoring** that tracks the implementation of PRSP policies and programs; measures inputs, activities, outputs and outcomes of programs and interventions; relies on routine administrative data from line ministries to local service units.
- **Expenditure tracking** may not be explicitly stated as part of PRSP monitoring but is necessary to relate costs to outcomes.

3.3 **Evaluation:** the systematic assessment of relevance, effectiveness, and/or efficiency of an activity or intervention, be it a program, project, policy, national initiative. Evaluation might be further differentiated by:

- **Function:** internal or external; self-evaluation or independent evaluation;
- **Type:** e.g., process evaluation, program reviews, outcome evaluation, impact evaluation; ex-ante, ongoing/formative, ex-post/summative
- **Design:** non-experimental/participatory, quasi-experimental, experimental
- **Purpose:** program improvement, accountability, knowledge generation, program promotion.

3.4 **Training:** a program designed to promote learning, skill development and application through changes in knowledge, attitudes, skills, behaviors, practices. The term “training” may connote a structured, one-way pedagogy of technical subject matter for specific skill development. Increasingly such terms as “learning program” or “educational program” are used to expand the focus to a series of activities and learning opportunities that are learner-centric, interactive and employ a mix of methods. For complementarity with the scope of work, the consultant uses the term “training” throughout but in the context of a broader, learner-centered approach. **Program** may be of any length, intensity or scope.
3.5 **Evaluation capacity development**: Intentional work to create and sustain organizational processes that make quality monitoring and evaluation and its use routine (Compton et al, 2002).

   a) The OED/WB defines *evaluation capacity development* as “concerned with strengthening or building M&E systems in borrower countries in order that a situation is attained where M&E is regularly conducted and utilized by the countries themselves-governments and civil society” (OED, 2005:1).

   b) A variety of terms are in use: M&E capacity development (M&ECD), evaluation capacity development (ECD); evaluation capacity building (ECB); evaluation capacity strengthening. *Evaluation capacity development* (ECD) appears to be preferred by ADB and WB. It is used in this report to connote monitoring and evaluation capacity development. Thus, for the purposes of this report, M&ECD and ECD are synonymous; the latter used for brevity.

   c) M&E training is distinguished from evaluation capacity development – see below.

3.6 **Locus of evaluation capacity development.** The OED definition above places the focus of evaluation capacity development within borrower countries. This report uses the broader definition (Compton et al, 2002) since evaluation capacity development applies in all organizations, not just borrower countries. Experience shows that the success of ECD within client organizations is influenced by the extent to which it is mainstreamed within the donor organization.

3.7 **During the course of this review it became apparent that individuals and groups were concerned with different contexts, different training audiences, and were using different frames of reference as they talked about M&E, often causing confusion. Three frames were identified, each representing a different focus and target audience:**

   1) **RMC/PRSP**: strengthening capacity of RMCs to be able to effectively monitor and evaluate their country poverty reduction strategies (focus of this consultancy);

   2) **RMC/CSP**: training RMCs to establish and implement effective M&E of the Bank Group’s country assistance portfolio;

   3) **ADB/CSP**: training ADB staff, principally country economists and sector program staff, to be able to support RMCs in their M&E work related to CSPs. This is fundamental to building RMC capacities in M&E.

**Points of Clarification**

3.8 Evaluation capacity development is a broad concept that involves more than training. Training is a necessary but insufficient for creating sustainable M&E systems.
Four pillars of M&E capacity building have been outlined by Schiavo-Campo (2005:2) as improvements in:

a. Institutional capacity, i.e., a move from less efficient to more efficient accountability rules and incentives;

b. Organizational capacity, i.e., the tailoring and adaptation of the organizational architecture of M&E government entities to the new and more efficient accountability rules and incentives;

c. Information and communication technology (ICT) capacity, using informatics for better and more timely information on results;

d. Human capacity, through training in M&E, but targeted on the sort of skills that are suited to the particular institutional and organizational context, and thus will actually be used and reinforced after they are imparted.

3.9 The scope of work for this review focused on M&E training; the human capacity pillar noted above. Section 6 discusses additional options to be considered as part of a broader strategy of evaluation capacity development in RMCs.

4. CONTEXT, ASSETS AND GAPS IN PRSP M&E

4.1 Data from the desk review, site visits and surveys were combined to describe the current situation in RMCs pertinent to identifying and prioritizing M&E training needs. A comprehensive status report of PRSP monitoring and evaluation or a diagnostic of M&E in individual countries was beyond the scope of this work. Information from the three site visit countries is included as illustration only; country situations are unique so generalizations are not intended.

4.2 M&E is widespread and visible: Every country PRSP includes a section on Monitoring and Evaluation that provides a description of the institutional arrangement for M&E, an analysis of the causes of and trends in poverty, quantitative targets for poverty reduction, and indicators for monitoring progress toward those targets. Most countries have a central unit, linked to high-level office, with designated M&E responsibilities (two exceptions from the survey data include CAR and Liberia). There is a much activity. But, quantity of activity begs the question of quality, purposefulness or extent to which the country “owns” M&E versus satisfying donor conditionalities.

4.3 Demand and supply: The lack of an accountability culture and demand for M&E characterize many current RMCs. Government demand is considered paramount for establishing and sustaining M&E systems. Demand is necessary to create a M&E system; but there must be a system that is producing useful information to create demand. Demand, however, is not static and may change with political developments and leadership change. Across the 19 PRSP countries for which the ADB economists reported, they gave their countries a 3.8 on a 5-point scale (very poor = 1; poor = 2;
fair = 3; good = 4; very good = 5) for level of demand. Civil society also creates demand. As the role of civil society continues to evolve and expand, it could be expected that domestic demand would stimulate M&E.

4.4 On the other hand, supply is the skills and resources available to conduct the M&E activities. While the supply of M&E capacities and M&E data may be considered secondary to demand, the two are interdependent. There must be supply of skills to meet growing demand. Interestingly, the ADB economists gave their countries a lower rating on supply; a rating of 2.6 on the 5-point scale. This speaks to the need for M&E capacity development.

4.5 **Different stages of PRSP development:** Countries are at different stages in development of their PRSP and M&E systems. Several countries (e.g., CAR, Congo, Sao Tome and Principe) are in the early stages of creating PRSPs. Others, including Tanzania, Mozambique, Uganda and Senegal are in their second generation with revisions being made based on experience. The date of PRSP preparation and stage of development tend to be associated with wider spread public sector capacity; and likely greater M&E capacity and readiness.

4.6 Different names and scope for PRSPs have emerged. In Tanzania, for example, the new PRSP, is named, National Strategy for Growth and Poverty Reduction (NSGPR or *mkukuta*). It has a 5 year time horizon, focus on outcomes versus sector orientation and three clusters: Growth and reduction of poverty; improved quality of life and social well-being; Good governance and accountability. The Poverty Monitoring System (PMS) that was established in 2001 with the 1st PRSP continues with some changes based on lessons learned. In Uganda, the PRSP is the PEAP (Poverty Eradication Action Plan). In Mozambique, it is the PARPA (Action Plan for the Reduction of Absolute Poverty).

4.7 Uganda provides an African example of a more mature system with significant lessons to learn from and experience to share. Like other PRSPs that have moved into the second generation, Uganda has made changes based on experience with their first 2001 Poverty Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy (PMES). In late 2003, a National Planning Authority was created and responsibility for M&E coordination assigned to the Office of the Prime Minister (OPM). Subsequently, the National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy (NIMES) was drafted, benefiting from the earlier experience. Situated in the OPM, the system covers all sectors and administrative levels: national, sector, district, sub-district, parish and is now moving down to the community level where results are most evident. The Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development, the original home of PEAP, continues to be actively engaged, certainly from the budgeting side. Reports go to the Cabinet through a National Coordination Committee and Technical Implementation Committee. The extensive PEAP Results and Policy Matrix guides all government monitoring (http://www.nimes.go.ug). The vision and holistic system are impressive. Individuals interviewed during the site visit were articulate and expressed commitment to effective and efficient performance.

---

1 See the many reports, case studies and notes on Uganda case. Uganda is a World Bank “high intensity” country for M&E capacity building.
measurement. It is, however, a system in evolution where use of results – showing the value of M&E – is necessary to sustain commitment. Significant time and resources have been expended on creating the comprehensive M&E system. Questions are being raised about whether the benefits warrant the effort.

4.8 **No Two are Alike:** Each country process, resulting PRSP and M&E system is unique. Individual countries face different pressures and opportunities; unique social, political and historical contexts. As a result, M&E looks different in each country. “…not only are the starting points faced by each country different, but so are the destinations to which they aspire” (Mackay, 2006:4). There is no single or “best” approach to M&E. “It all depends.”

4.9 **M&E in evolution:** Not only is each different, but each is evolving according to its own circumstances. M&E and M&E training needs could be considered a “moving target”. PRSPs and their M&E strategies continue to evolve. A variety of internal and external factors are influencing this evolution: history, possibilities, preferences, resources, political pressures, civil society input, donor demands and strategies, etc. Also, results-based management is relatively new. Systems and procedures are evolving. Even in western nations, the most developed evaluation systems have only been designed recently (Canada, Ireland, U.S.). Where public sector capacity is strong, M&E systems can take 10 years or more to develop. This length of time could be expected to be longer in the developing country context.

4.10 **Institutional arrangements:** At a general level, country institutional arrangements for M&E are broadly similar. The designated function of monitoring and evaluation is usually located within the Office of the Prime Minister or Vice President. A variety of groups and committees are involved in aspects of M&E. Implementing committees and work groups might include:

- A high-level steering committee providing political visibility, support and oversight; overall coordination; usual membership includes core ministries.

- A national secretariat providing a focal point for consolidating input from working groups and for implementing the M&E system including reporting. All but two of the 19 countries represented in the economist responses have a central RPSP M&E Unit or group responsible for PRSP M&E.

- A number of cross-sector working groups and sector committees responsible for technical support, identifying indicators, compiling data, and preparing sector reports; include representation from line ministries, national statistics office, donors and civil society; may have small budget. At the time of the Tanzanian site visit, two work groups had been consolidated leaving three:
  - Routine data collection/census/surveys
  - Research and analysis
  - Dissemination, sensitization and advocacy

- Existing Planning Units and/or M&E units within the line ministries responsible for routine administrative data
• The National Statistics Office as the primary source of data and authority on data standards and quality.

4.11 Some countries have established mechanisms for involving civil society. Examples include the Poverty Monitoring Committee in Tanzania and the Poverty Observatory in Mozambique. The latter reportedly includes more than 440 different groups representing the many facets of civil society: local and international NGOs, labor unions, business, churches, local organizations, media, etc.

4.12 **Multiple levels of implementation:** M&E is practiced at multiple levels across various systems: national; sector ministries; administrative levels (central, regional, district, community); project and service delivery levels. Some training needs and demands are similar at all levels (understanding approach and vocabulary). Others are specific to a given level, position or sector. Sector capacities within a country vary. Central ministries such as Finance and Planning and large line ministries such as education, health, and agriculture tend to be better resourced, may be more invested in M&E and influential.

4.13 Much of the M&E emphasis, to date, has centered at the national level to support good governance – creating a national system, formulating the broad M&E strategy, encouraging national leadership and commitment, coordinating the multiple macro-level bodies that are involved, building national-level expertise. With the demand for civil society participation, increasing attention is being paid to the capacities needed to promote authentic and meaningful civil society participation. Less attention has been paid to the middle levels in the ministerial and administrative systems where adequate functioning is critical. For most countries, capacity weaknesses at the sub-national levels are widespread; this was particularly reiterated in Mozambique.

4.14 Given the multiple levels and environments in which M&E occurs, coordination is a major issue: coordination in M&E system design, coordination across sector and administrative bodies, coordination in data collection; coordination among donors. Examples of duplication, competition, gaps and delays are common. PRSP is leading, for the first time, to the integration of different administrative structures, processes and data collection activities into a single national system but unified systems are slow to emerge.

4.15 **Many working in M&E:** Membership in the various M&E groups and committees may range from 1-2 people to over 50. The central unit which is often a coordinating unit usually includes several individuals. Then, there are focal points in the sector ministries (may be 1-2 people; may be within the Planning and Policy Directorate; may be a special M&E Unit). At the technical working group level members may

---

2 In some instances, cooperation, not coordination may be the obstacle (see review of the Uganda case where “paper” coordinating committees masked real cooperation, OED, 2004:50).

3 One of the main difficulties in performing this review was the lack of contact persons or names of people working in M&E by country or region. There is critical need to establish and maintain a database of individuals and groups in RMCs engaged in M&E.
include the core M&E staff and/or others, including the national statistics office, sector representatives, academics/researchers, and members of civil society, most notably local and international NGOs. Subsequent levels in the country’s M&E system include sector and administrative levels – district, local government, service delivery.

4.16 Governments may contract out their M&E work. Local NGOs, university academics and consultants are key players and contributors in PRSP M&E. In Zanzibar, a professor from the local University heads the M&E system. In Tanzania, private researchers conduct poverty assessments and impact analyses. Local training institutes support and provide courses relevant for building M&E capacity.

4.17 “Who” is involved in PRSP M&E might include any of the following (Table 1). They become potential audiences of M&E training.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. RMC groups and individuals involved in PRSP M&amp;E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National secretariat: Coordinator, staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRSP M&amp;E workgroup: Chairs; members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry (Central and Line Ministries): Ministers, Directors of Planning Units; key staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National statistics office: Director; staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District and local administrative units: Directors, staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Forums: Leaders, members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research institutes and organizations: Researchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College, university, training institute: Academics, trainers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-governmental organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local consultants; evaluators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expatriate consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil society: members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.18 Position titles provided by RMC survey respondents suggest the type and diversity of players involved in PRSP M&E: Chief Technical Advisor, Macroeconomist, Permanent Secretary of the PRSP Technical Unit, Assistant Commissioner for Coordination and Monitoring, Executive member of NGO Association, drafting team of PRSP, Chief Government Statistician, Planning Officer, Expert at the Technical Secretary of PRSP Unit, Principal Planner/Social Development Unit, Economist. Each has different backgrounds, training, and responsibilities in M&E and consequently, different training needs.

4.19 Not included in this analysis are policy makers and government officials who are not directly involved in the “activities” of M&E but who are key users of M&E. They may have substantial influence in formulation of a system, its credibility, value, and use of generated data in policy formulation, analysis, decision making, and resource allocations. Such leaders form a key target group for better understanding M&E function, its benefits and pay-offs, and use of M&E data.

4.20 M&E Roles and Activities: What are all these people doing? What are the M&E tasks and responsibilities? From a content analysis of the site interviews, a list of 13 M&E activities was compiled that can be organized by the standard components of
evaluation planning (Table 2). Each component or individual activity could be linked to fundamental attitudes; knowledge and skills needed for effective performance and that could be strengthened through appropriate, learner-centered training. Future analysis might assess and compare the in-practice activities with requisite activities for an effective, functioning M&E system to identify gaps and weaknesses and areas to strengthen.

Table 2. M&E activities as identified by study respondents; organized by evaluation planning components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• overall M&amp;E system design</td>
<td>• indicator development</td>
<td>• routine data collection</td>
<td>• participatory poverty assessments (PPAs), beneficiary assessments</td>
<td>• report preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• management and coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td>• survey and/or census implementation</td>
<td>• poverty impact assessments</td>
<td>• communications and dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• civil society participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• other evaluation studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.21 RMC survey respondents most frequently reported involvement in (1) overall M&E system design and (2) poverty impact assessment. Other frequent activities include data analysis; management/coordination, indicator development, and reporting. Results are included only as illustration since the numbers are small and response links to the individual’s position, country resources and context.

4.22 Training/work experience in M&E: The amount, level and type of training individuals have received in M&E varies considerably. From the 25 interviewed during the site visits, two had attended evaluation-specific training: the Coordinator of the Ugandan NIMES attended IPDET in Canada; and the national PMS coordinator in Mozambique attended the ADB Tunis workshop in 2005. Other members of the Mozambique Poverty Monitoring System (PMS) had attended a 3 week workshop on poverty monitoring in Malaysia and mention was made of attendance at other international and regional conferences/workshops (UNDP finances an in-country Program Officer working directly with the national coordinating unit). Uganda and Tanzania are unique in that both receive significant donor support, with emphasis on M&E. Outside of donor support, few government resources appear to be designated to M&E, above and beyond the allocations to existing administrative and agency functions.

4.23 Seventy-three percent of the survey respondents reported having received training in M&E, from 1 week to 1 month in duration. Identified topics/courses included: participatory service delivery assessment; M&E on HIV/AIDS; Training of Trainers on MDG Indicators and Poverty Monitoring; Poverty diagnosis and measurement; Introduction to project M&E. These titles reflect findings from the desk review: a variety of trainings and courses offered by a variety of agencies/organizations/institutes resulting in fragmented and sporadic capacity development. This study found little evidence of
coordination or synergy among the various courses offered and relatively few that are PRSP M&E-specific.

4.24 For a list of current M&E training courses as identified during the desk review see Annex 7. Study respondents expressed little awareness of the range of offerings available or the wealth of M&E materials and resources that can be found on the web.

4.25 Besides training, the common practice is to learn on-the-job. Interestingly, nearly half of the survey respondents reported working in M&E for five or more years (range from 5-15 years). Such work might be associated with positions in planning units, statistical offices or project-related M&E work.

4.26 **National Statistical Capacity Development:** M&E relies on data, much of which comes through the national statistical systems where weaknesses have long been recognized. The new results emphasis and monitoring development effectiveness has focused attention on the quality of statistics and need to improve national capacities and systems. A number of international initiatives are in place with ADB participation. These initiatives involve building infrastructure and strengthening systems as well as strengthening skills to produce, manage, analyze, use and communicate data in ways that decision makers can use it. The Tanzanian National Statistics Office Director, in particular, recognized the ADB support and stressed the increased focus on user-friendly, user-responsive analysis and communications.

4.27 **Local Resources Available:** Local universities, training and research institutes, NGOs and/or consultants are filling PRSP M&E demands, either in terms of providing training, conducting research and evaluation studies or filling M&E roles in the government system. During the site visits, interviews were conducted at the Eastern and Southern Africa Management Institute (ESAMI) in Dar es Salaam and at the Institute of Social Research at Makerere University in Kampala. In Mozambique, where capacity needs are widespread, management training institutes and consulting groups are “springing up like mushrooms” to meet the demand. Two of the faculty members interviewed at Makerere had attended the IPDET training (Canada) and had turned the curriculum into a regional training course.


---

4 -General Data Dissemination System (GDDS) GDS (http://dsbb.imf.org/Applications/web/gdds/gddshome/)
4.29 Country professional evaluation associations also are on the rise. Currently 16 country evaluation associations are listed on the AfrEA website including Benin, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Comoros, Ghana, Kenya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritania, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, South Africa, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia, Zimbabwe. Capacities and levels of functioning are unknown.

4.30 Study respondents expressed limitations in availability of M&E resources in French and Portuguese.

4.31 **Gaps and Issues:** Table 3 reports the top ten issues that were most frequently identified as gaps in PRSP M&E across all data sources. The strongest and most consistent data were found for the first four listed gaps: (1) coordination; (2) use of M&E data, including analytical capabilities, and (3) performance indicators (4) generation of timely and relevant data. Selected data from the interviews are included in the table to provide clarity and context.

4.32 **Training topics:** Of 12 potential training topics, survey respondents most frequently selected *Building a monitoring and evaluation system for results-based accountability* as a topic for M&E training of national level staff. Other frequently selected topics included *Performance Indicators, Use of M&E Information* and *Engaging stakeholders/civil society participation*. The complete list of training topics is found in Question 12 of the survey (Annex 3).

4.33 **Pedagogical approaches:** Site interviews were used to explore perspectives about effective training design and pedagogical preferences. All respondents stressed the importance of hands-on application, experiential learning, participatory methods, opportunities to share and network with others, and grounding any training in country realities. Mentioned was the common problem of lack of transfer and application of training content to actual country work, resulting in too little benefit from training for the country itself.

**Table 3. Gaps identified in PRSP M&E**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Coordination</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties in coordinating processes across many groups, systems, levels, partners, donors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple existing systems with separate procedures and needs for data collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Utilization of M&amp;E data in decision making</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of analytical capabilities to analyze, interpret and use data that are produced; “What do the data mean? What are we learning from the data? What are the data limitations?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inability to translate data into action, use data in decision making, particularly budgeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern about the value that the M&amp;E system adds to government if appropriate outcome measures are not linked to budget decision making “to make a difference in people’s lives”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Practical, targeted performance indicators</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long-term indicators, associated with broad goals, that are aggregated measures, not useful for decision making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance and importance of selected indicators. “Are the results, as shown in the statistics, really making a difference in the quality of life of the poor?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement of indicators: Uncertainties about if or how selected indicators can be measured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many indicators to realistically monitor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Measurement and data collection that provides timely, useful data
   - Limitations in routine data collection resulting from lack of equipment, standardized procedures, staffing, and coordination across ministries.
   - Inadequacy of survey and census data to provide data for ongoing information needs, decision making or policy discussions. “We can’t wait for survey data.”
   - Lack of disaggregation to a level useful for decision making, in particular, by gender.
   - Non-strategic, priority data. “What data do we really need? What baseline data is appropriate; important, necessary?” “Yes, there are lots of data but are they what we need for what we are doing?”
   - Trustworthiness of data related to accuracy and reliability of data that are available

5. Leadership commitment
   - Lack of committed leadership at all levels- leaders who know and understand value of M&E
   - Lack of demand for credible data, “Leadership needs to demand information, ask tough questions and challenge everyone.”

6. Civil society participation; stakeholder engagement
   - Limitations of civil society to be equal partners with government
   - Limited stakeholder engagement in M&E system; centralized decision making

7. Common understanding of M&E in RBM
   - Confusion about approach and terminology
   - Lack of a common understanding and commitment among the many involved

8. Methods and practice of evaluation
   - Few with knowledge of evaluation or how to plan, conduct and use evaluation
   - Emphasis is poverty monitoring

9. Methods and practice of monitoring
   - Limited knowledge of and skills in monitoring

10. Planning capacity
    - Constraints in experience and capacities in planning as prerequisite to M&E

5. M&E PRSP TRAINING NEEDS

5.1 Needs at all levels: It is clear that M&E training needs are broad and deep (not unlike in the U.S. public sector). The number of individuals and variety of activities involved in building and sustaining national PRSP M&E systems are vast. A certain level of capacity is necessary at each level if quality data are to flow and be utilized at the level where decision making is relevant. Training needs relate to institutional, organizational, information as well as human capacity development, more typically defined as M&E training.

5.2 Target audience: This study began to identify individuals, groups and countries actively involved in PRSP M&E implementation. At the time of the site visits, OPEV identified national staff as the target group of interest. While more assistance has been provided at the national level, the needs at the national level are still great; not all countries have been equally served, nor all groups and individuals included. Also, many individuals and groups make up the “national level”. More work is needed to further
clarify key audiences – contact names and responsibilities - and to continually assess their needs in the context of PRSP evolution. The study found that little training, if any, has been directed to the sub-national levels; clearly targets needing attention. Sector programming also provides opportunities for targeted intervention.

5.3 Training has generally been targeted to individuals – the audience is defined as individuals and learning objectives are written to achieve individual outcomes. However, organizations do not necessarily change or improve their performance when individuals alone are trained. There is a need to move beyond individuals as the audience and consider the training audience as teams or groups (e.g., teams of high level officials; country teams (ADB and country partners); M&E working groups; sectors) as well as whole institutions (country-level). Learning objectives, then, become team/group-focused outcomes or country-focused capacity outcomes.

5.4 Readiness: Assessment of “readiness” is needed in order to effectively utilize limited training investments. Experience demonstrates the necessity of a certain level of readiness for training impacts to be achieved. This applies whether individual, group/organization or country-level. MacKay’s (1999) Diagnostic Guide and Action Framework may be helpful (or a simplified version) for assessing, or working with a country to assess its evaluation capacity and readiness for change. Precursor steps may be necessary such as strategic planning before M&E begins. Some countries may be too chaotic to warrant M&E investments. Other diagnostic or readiness checklists are needed for individual or team/group diagnosis. Such diagnoses are useful in recruitment and selection as well as in providing baseline and information that the participant can use in self-directed learning.

5.5 Training topics: Potential M&E training topics are numerous. One of the difficult aspects when considering M&E training is the wide range of knowledge and skills involved. And, it is clear from this study that M&E topics are not just technical in nature. It is not just a matter of knowing good survey methods, statistical analyses, questionnaire construction, techniques of poverty assessment. Effective M&E requires technical knowledge and skills but it also depends upon effective process skills (ability to facilitate, work in teams, resolve conflict, coordinate, collaborate, build consensus). At the same time, it depends upon organizational development (strategic planning, leadership development, management, organizational design and structures), and institution building (rewards and incentives, professional development systems, information infrastructure). To date, much of the M&E training has been technical in nature. There is a need to broaden “M&E topics” and combine technical subject matter with process, organizational and institutional building knowledge and skills.

5.6 This needs assessment prioritized a number of topics: building a RBM M&E system; performance indicators; using data in decision making; civil society participation; building committed leaders; timely and useful data collection; coordination in M&E systems. The most salient topics include:
5.7 **RBM M&E:** The priority given to this topic by study respondents reflects the ongoing need to extend and reinforce the basics of results-based M&E. Despite the more advanced experience of some countries, results-based M&E is a new approach. The concepts are not intuitive and are not gained in a single training. Continued reinforcement of the basic concepts is necessary as well as providing opportunities for countries to continue to strengthen their own understandings. There are available resources to use (e.g., WB training course; book by Kusek and Rist (2004)) and country cases to apply in creating meaningful training assistance.

5.8 **Performance indicators**\(^5\): This study found widespread need for help in selecting and measuring useful, practical, and meaningful indicators along a chain of results. The problems associated with PRSP indicators are reiterated in all PRSP documentation. Identifying a core set of priority indicators is a first step in performance measurement, a necessary precursor to data collection. Many resources exist related to indicators and indicator development. It is unclear how relevant existing materials are for current needs. The consultant’s experience in working with public sector personnel is that most available materials need to be contextualized and simplified and need to incorporate examples that resonate with the audience and are pertinent to their position and responsibilities. Practical, context-specific training and learning resources are needed coupled with continued practice to fully understand and use indicators for results-based accountability.

5.9 **Creating and sustaining leadership:** Without leaders who value and are committed to using M&E, training impact is unlikely to be realized. Training content to build leadership commitment has moved from advocacy and awareness building about the value of M&E to focus on specific benefits that leaders and institutions can gain from M&E – “what’s in this for me” – using real examples that have credibility with leaders. There is continuing need to further understand what training content is likely to have a greater impact with leaders in different contexts and design training response accordingly. The World Bank has been active in training of government officials in results-based M&E.

5.10 **Coordination:** Improved coordination at multiple levels (coordination in M&E system design, coordination across sector and administrative bodies, coordination in data collection; coordination among donors) is a clear need. While not typically thought of as a M&E training topic, there is subject matter and processes to facilitate improved coordination that a training program could address.

---

\(^5\) Inadequacies in indicator development is consistently identified in all documented literature as a major issue, particularly the lack of interim or progress indicators that link investments to results, “the missing middle” (Booth and Lucas, 2001) and relevance and usefulness of selected indicators. This is the consultant’s own experience in the US public sector and is addressed by Schiavo-Campo (2005:11):

> “…the best organizational arrangements for monitoring and evaluating government programs rest on sand unless strong and realistic results indicators are elaborated to begin with….It could be perhaps the highest contribution of external assistance to M&E capacity in developing countries to hammer in this essential point, and help countries develop a robust dialogue on accountability for results, and introduce a few, simple, clear, and monitorable performance measures when, and only when, they are appropriate.”
Data generation/data collection methods: Constraints in data production were identified as a primary gap in this study. M&E training topics typically include the range of topics associated with data collection: survey design, participatory methods, community scorecards, rapid appraisal techniques, etc. Information obtained during this study, however, emphasized that the gap is in terms of “timely and useful” data, versus the knowledge and skills related to individual data collection methods. This does not imply that technical subject matter is not important or needed. It does indicate, however, that there is the need to address “what” needs to be collected (i.e., indicator selection) and data flows, not just the “how tos” of data collection methods.

Customize training: The great variation and uniqueness of country situations and PRSP implementation speak to the need for customizing M&E training. Country contexts, realities and circumstances are different. The way PRSPs and M&E evolve is different. Country capacities and resources are different. RBM is a new strategy that is evolving. Donor approaches and harmonization efforts are evolving. While results-based management may include a set of standard steps and M&E may include a set of standard tools, methods and expertise, implementation is incremental, non-linear and can be expected to be different in each situation. There is no “best-practice” model, set sequence of steps or activities, or “one shoe fits all”. It will be important to design flexible training assistance, incremental approaches, be able to capitalize on “windows of opportunity” and provide for “just-in-time-learning” (available when needed).

For the Bank Group’s training program, customization can be addressed in several ways: (1) generic content with the training designed to facilitate participant interaction with the material in order to customize to their own situation; (2) develop country/situation-specific materials for training in-country; (3) partner with participants to develop and implement the M&E training/capacity development effort.

Pedagogy: Trainees are critical consumers. Any training program needs to apply best practices in adult learning and ground the content in realities participants face. As programs are designed, there is need to pay attention to those factors that link to better learner outcomes:

- Relevant to learner needs at right skill level: beginning, intermediate, advanced
- Careful selection so that the right individual, team/group, country is selected
- Practical and concrete content
- Quality materials and activities
- Quality instruction and facilitation, appropriate to learning styles
- Active learner participation
- Partner involvement in design and implementation
- Time provided for interaction with instructors, each other and for discussion
- Use of action plans and follow-up to check on implementation of plans
- Ongoing opportunities for learning and sharing
5.15 The case method offers a powerful approach that is underutilized in evaluation and in the development evaluation context. The development of cases based on PRSP M&E implementation would provide important resources for ongoing use.

5.16 An assessment of e-learning possibilities was not undertaken. The current availability and use of web-based learning is unknown but merit consideration. Experience is growing in the U.S. and the development context in the use of a blended learning approach to capacity development that integrates a mix of methods – web, videoconferencing, CD-Rom, face-to-face - to provide training across distances and subject matter areas.

5.17 **Transfer of learning:** It is noteworthy that site respondents initiated discussions related to the transfer of learning and value of training. Explicit attention needs to be paid to ways in which training – particularly curriculum design, participant selection, and follow-up - can effectively facilitate greater transfer and application of learning.

5.18 **Donor coordination in M&E training:** The need for collaboration and coordination in the provision of M&E training is evident. The variety of ad hoc courses, fragmentation of offerings, redundancy in resources that are available, extent of demand, and continued weaknesses in national M&E capacity all speak to the need for greater coherency in M&E training and capacity development. Likewise, there is great need for sharing of lessons learned regarding:

- What are “promising practices” in PRSP M&E in Africa;
- What M&E training and ECD initiatives work; don’t work; in which contexts and why.

5.19 **Cost-effectiveness:** Single-shot training rarely is cost-effective. Attention needs to be paid to ways in which training programs and learning resources can be reused, repurposed and embedded in a system of wider institutional and organizational capacity development. If the desired end result of training is to improve practice and change behaviors of individuals, groups and institutions, then training programs need to include/connect to a range of supports (technical assistance, ongoing mentoring, follow-up activities, networking, etc) in a coherent way that will facilitate achievement of the intended desired outcomes. This demands a broader view of training involving more resources and commitment to assistance over the longer term.

6. **STRATEGIES FOR M&E TRAINING TO BUILD RMC CAPACITY**

6.1 The issues facing current PRSP M&E point to a compendium of training needs. Training is a core and necessary component of evaluation capacity development. The demand for training is large and growing. The scope and intent of a Bank Group training strategy depends upon institutional priorities, resources, responsibilities and capacities. A long-term training plan, aligned with other donor plans, would provide the vision and goals for strategy implementation. For any strategy, key attributes include customization,
pedagogical quality, transfer of learning, program sustainability and coordination with other donors. It is also expected that any training intervention would be done in collaboration with relevant local entities, e.g., AfrEA, national evaluation associations, local training and research institutes.

**RMC Training**

6.2 While the following options are discussed individually, they are not mutually exclusive. It is possible to design a training intervention using a combination of these strategies. For example, the draft training curriculum (Annex 8) combines options A. and B. Any strategy can be implemented by region, country, language grouping or level of PRSP M&E implementation. Respondent demand, substantiated by training best practice evidence, called for training programs to be delivered at the region or country level.

A. **Content – focus:** In this typical approach, training is designed to increase knowledge, skills, and/or application related to certain content. Content may be either supply or demand driven. The training is designed and delivered for a specific skill level: beginning, intermediate, advanced. Often, participation is open and voluntary. Better results accrue when participants are recruited (selected) according to the relevance of the topic to their actual responsibilities and on-the-job circumstances. For example, training on indicator development is targeted to all individuals throughout a country system playing a key role in indicator development. Careful recruitment and selection criteria are developed accordingly. The training is designed to allow and help participants customize the content for their own learning and application.

B. **Audience – focus:** The training program is designed to respond to the needs of a particular audience. Audience in this sense refers to the various individuals and groups (working groups, units, ministries, sectors) involved in PRSP M&E implementation. Any number of ways to segment audiences might be considered:

1. Institutional level: e.g., macro (national level), meso level (region/district level), micro (local level of government and service delivery)

2. Team/Group: e.g., ministry, sector, major project; National Secretariat

3. Individuals: e.g., heads of central planning units; heads of working groups; regional level managers

4. Level of PRSP M&E implementation: start-up countries; 1st generation countries; 2nd generation countries

The better the audience is understood – needs, background, learning styles – and the training is designed accordingly, the greater the learning outcomes.
C. **Country-focused:** The training program is designed relative to a single country, fully customized to the country context. A particular application of this strategy might be the ADB/RMC country team as the focus. Both the RMC and ADB potentially benefit. Country teams diagnose M&E readiness, prepare an action plan for country M&E capacity building, and implement the plan. It is a comprehensive approach that is country-driven and customized. It demands requisite interest and readiness on the part of the ADB country staff who are providing ongoing support, overtime assistance, and resources to implement the M&E plan. This appears to be a current WB approach so there would be opportunities for co-learning and sharing of experience.

**Proposed Training Curriculum**

6.3 As draft design for a one week-long workshop was developed (Annex 8):

- **Target audience:** 20-25 national level staff across Africa (not country-specific)
- **Content:** focused; based on needs identified from needs assessment study
- **Length:** 5 days
- **Location:** Tunis initially; future regional or country implementation intended
- **Date:** to be conducted in 2006 in collaboration with JAI and ADI

6.4 Two topics, from those identified during the needs assessment, were selected for focused attention: (1) results-based M&E including results chain and (2) performance indicators. These are fundamental core topics. The proposed curriculum provides a feasible, focused module based on expressed needs that could be implemented and converted into a learning resource for ongoing use. Its merits lie in the fact that (1) there are existing resources to draw on making it feasible to deliver the workshop in 2006; (2) it provides an opportunity for ADB to partner with RMCs in M&E training; (3) it incorporates sound pedagogy with attention to follow-up and ongoing learning. It is expected that the module would be repurposed for other uses (translated into other languages, used with other audiences (including ADB staff, in other locales, packaged for web use).

**Train ADB staff in M&E**

6.5 RMC capacity cannot be viewed in isolation. Experience shows the interdependencies that exist between the quality of an organization’s M&E and ability of the client to conduct and utilize M&E. Internal and external M&E are closely linked and mutually reinforcing. It is no longer a case of “training others” but also “training ourselves” and creating the internal, institutional incentives and structures that support results-based M&E, that link planning, implementation and results. A specific area of training for the Bank Group is training of ADB staff.

6.6 Donors are expected to recognize country priorities and align assistance to support PRSP priorities; thus, CSPs are to be aligned with the country PRSP. There is
need to provide relevant training and support to all ADB staff who are involved in CSP design and implementation so they can more effectively support their RMC partners, both in terms of PRSP M&E and CSP M&E (CSP links to the country’s overall poverty reduction strategy). This will benefit the RMCs as well as ADB.

6.7 This review did not assess ADB in-house needs or focus on internal capacity building. The economist survey asked economists for their opinions of RMC needs; not their own needs. It was evident, however, over the course of this review that there are varying levels of understanding among ADB staff concerning the meaning of M&E, guidance and responsibilities for M&E, and the methods and approaches of M&E. Work is underway within the Bank to clarify internal procedures and guidelines for greater coherency. An OPEV evaluation on the “Efficacy and Efficiency of Monitoring-Evaluation Systems (MES) for Projects Financed by the Bank Group,” completed in May 2004, provides recommendations for strengthening internal Bank capacities to support and improve M&E of Bank Group financed projects/programmes (ADB, 2004). As part of this work, it is recommended that a study be undertaken to better understand country program staff M&E training needs and a training program, for incremental learning and strengthening of skills, be designed and implemented. Such a training program would be aligned with any RMC training program (same concepts, approaches, language consistent with RBM approach) and aligned with the ADB RMF and donor harmonization efforts.

**Train the Trainer – Suppliers of M&E training in Africa**

6.8 As the study shows, various training and research institutes, local consultants, and NGOs are filling the demand in providing M&E training. Level of expertise and quality of training that is being provided is unknown. A variety of options exist that would provide support for these “suppliers” who deliver RMC M&E training. For example,

1. a training program designed and implemented to “train the trainer”;

2. ADB support to individuals for them to attend/participate in other M&E training programs (e.g., IPDET);

3. ADB support to local training programs that target RMC M&E needs. Experience of the Makerere University/WB Training Pilot Project (OED, 2005) might provide suggestions;

4. ADB support for professional development workshops offered at the 2006 AfrEA Conference in Niamey in January 2007 that respond to PRSP M&E needs. The American Evaluation Association, for example, runs a series of half-day; full-day and two-day workshops in conjunction with its annual conference.

---

M&E Resource Development/Access

6.9 Fundamental to M&E training are the resources and materials that make M&E learning possible and provide for ongoing learning, outside the training setting. There is a wealth of M&E resources available on the web. However, access and use by public sector personnel is limited. Experience demonstrates that for use to occur, materials must be relevant, user-friendly, limited in number, and readily accessible; available in French, Portuguese as well as English. There is need to identify and/or develop and make readily available simple and practical learning materials relevant for country staff working in PRSP M&E. Such learning resources also could be used by other trainers across the continent to promote and extend the M&E culture. Options to consider:

1. Use existing resources/curricula and adapt/modify to African context, using African cases and examples

2. Create new resources, as needed, based on country experience and demand


Other Capacity Building Options

6.10 Scholarships, sponsorships, funding to other, specific target groups:

- AfrEA: support to strengthen association; to build member capacity; to implement activities that advance African M&E capacity;

- Country/national evaluation associations: support to strengthen association; to build member capacity; to implement activities

- African evaluators: individual scholarships, training funds for professional development;

- University programs: funds to train government staff; that train and prepare university students, including graduate programs, short courses, seminars;

- Local consultants and private sector organizations involved in or capable of providing M&E

Joint efforts:

- Joint evaluation capacity development projects of African trainers, evaluators, institutions (similar to joint evaluation projects)
- Partnerships between ADB and select RMCs to develop M&E capacity
- Networking and cross-country collaboration
- Donor coordination and collaboration in M&E training and ECD
- Joint evaluations that build RMC capacity
Other financial support:

- RMC-led country evaluations
- Cross-country visits; sharing; study tours
- Pairing arrangements between governments to share and learn together
- Twinning arrangements that pair a country with a specialized professional evaluation institute for in-country ECD
- Long-term/short-term technical assistance personnel

6.11 As discussed at the outset, capacity development involves more than training. For ECD (M&ECD) to succeed, a long time horizon is needed, consistent investments of resources and a focus on institutional, organization and information as well as human capacity development. It is clear that there is a role and demand for M&E training that can only be expected to grow. Attention needs to be paid to ways in which training programs and learning resources can be reused, repurposed and embedded in a system of wider institutional and organizational capacity development. If the desired end result of training is to improve practice and change behaviors of individuals, groups and institutions, then training programs need to include/connect to a range of supports (technical assistance, ongoing mentoring, follow-up activities, networking) in a coherent way that will facilitate achievement of the intended desired outcomes.

6.12 The scope and intent of a Bank Group training strategy depends upon institutional priorities, resources, responsibilities and capacities. A long-term training plan, aligned with other donor plans, would provide the vision and goals for strategy implementation. For any strategy, key attributes include customization, pedagogical quality, transfer of learning, program sustainability and coordination with other donors. It is also expected that any training intervention would be done in collaboration with relevant local entities, e.g., AfrEA, national evaluation associations, local training and research institutes.
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The Operations Evaluation Department of the African Development Bank plans to conduct a monitoring and evaluation (M&E) training program in 2006 in collaboration with the Joint Africa Institute. This training program will be for national level staff in Regional Member Countries who are involved in the monitoring and evaluation of the country’s PRSP. In order to ensure a useful and successful training program, we are seeking your input about training needs and priorities.

Please complete the following questionnaire and return to A. Kone by Friday February 10, 2006 via email at a.kone@afdb.org or post at
Mme. A. Kone
Operations Evaluation Department
African Development Bank
B.P. 323-1002
Tunis Belvedere
Tunisia

---

1. Name of country:

2. Your name:

3. What is your current position (title)?

4. How long have you been in this position? (# years)

5. Which of the following groups do you represent? (Please check all that apply)
   [ ] a. National secretariat (national coordinating unit)
   [ ] b. PRSP M&E workgroup (technical workgroup)
   [ ] c. Ministry; sector
   [ ] d. National statistics office
   [ ] e. Civil society
   [ ] f. Research organization
   [ ] g. Higher education (college, university, training institute)
   [ ] h. Non-governmental organization
   [ ] i. Local consultant
   [ ] j. Expatriate consultant
   [ ] k. Donor
   [ ] l. Private sector
   [ ] m. Other: please specify_____________________

---

7 Monitoring is the regular tracking of inputs, activities, outputs, reach, outcomes and impact of development activities. Evaluation is the systematic and objective assessment of the relevance, efficacy or efficiency of a development activity (OED, 2004).
6. In which of the following activities are you currently involved (or have been involved in the past relative to PRSP M&E)? (Check all that apply)
   [ ] a. Development of the national Monitoring and Evaluation system (national M&E plan/strategy)
   [ ] b. Coordination/management of the monitoring and evaluation system
   [ ] c. Indicator development
   [ ] d. Survey and/or census implementation
   [ ] e. Routine data collection
   [ ] f. Participatory poverty assessments
   [ ] g. Poverty impact analysis
   [ ] h. Research
   [ ] i. Data analysis and interpretation
   [ ] j. Report preparation of M&E findings
   [ ] k. Communications and dissemination of M&E information
   [ ] l. Civil society participation
   [ ] m. Evaluation studies
   [ ] n. Others, please list ________________

PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS RELATIVE TO ANY EXPERIENCE WITH M&E, NOT JUST RELATIVE TO THE PRSP M&E.

7. How long have you been working in monitoring and/or evaluation?
   [ ] a. 0-6 months
   [ ] b. 7 months – 1 year
   [ ] c. 1-2 years
   [ ] d. 2-3 years
   [ ] e. 3 years or longer

8. Have you received training (workshops, seminars, diploma program, training course) in monitoring and/or evaluation?
   [ ] a. YES
   [ ] b. NO

9. If YES, please specify:
   [ ] a. Name of training/course:
   [ ] b. Length:
   [ ] c. Organization/agency that sponsored the training:
   [ ] d. Location:

10. Are you aware of other M&E training programs or courses that exist? If so, please list them:

11. Following is a list of features commonly associated with M&E and where gaps often exist. In which of these (if any) do you see gaps or problems affecting the country’s PRSP monitoring and evaluation work? (Check all where you see gaps or problems AND place a star (*) next to three where you think improvements are most needed)
12. Next is a list of some M&E training topics. Which three (3) do you think would be the most useful for national level M&E staff? [Place a #1 between the [ ] to indicate your top priority; place a #2 for your second priority and a #3 for your third training priority. Please select ONLY THREE]

[ ] a. Building a Monitoring and Evaluation System for results-based accountability: structures; processes; promising practices
[ ] b. Engaging stakeholders; civil society participation
[ ] c. Results chain, program logic, logic model/logframe
[ ] d. Turning vague goals into measurable outcomes; choosing outcomes to measure
[ ] e. Performance indicators: selection and measurement of process and short-medium-long term outcome indicators and impact indicators
[ ] f. Setting baselines and targets
[ ] g. Data collection methods: promising practices in quantitative and qualitative methods, rapid assessment techniques; participatory approaches
[ ] h. Analysis and interpretation of data: strategic sense making; limitations of data; user-oriented analysis
[ ] i. Reporting and dissemination of data; user-friendly ways to report and share information to various audiences
[ ] j. Use of M&E information in policy development, planning, resource allocation decisions, budgeting, program improvement
[ ] k. Monitoring: tools and methods for ongoing tracking of performance
[ ] l. Evaluation: tools and methods for learning what works, what doesn’t, and why
[ ] m. Impact assessment; causal questions of development effectiveness
[ ] n. Sustaining a M&E system
[ ] o. Other:

13. If you have any suggestions or specific interests/needs related to any of the training topics listed above, please include them here:
14. What specific knowledge and skills would you want to gain or develop if you were to attend an M&E training program? Please be as specific as possible.

   a. I would like to learn:

   b. As a result of training, I would like to be able to do:

15. Please include any other comments or suggestions you would like to add.
Annex 3

SURVEY RESPONSE

Email survey response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th># Responses</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADB country economists (PRSP countries)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADB country representatives</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional member countries (RMCs)(^8)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nineteen countries represented in the economist responses include: Benin, Burkina Faso, CAR, Republic of Congo, Ivory Coast, Ethiopia, Eritrea, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Liberia, Lesotho, Malawi, Mali, Niger, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principle, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Tanzania.

ADB Country Representatives include Tanzania, Uganda.

Five countries are represented in the response from the regional member countries (CAR, Gambia, Malawi, Tanzania/Zanzibar, Uganda). The eleven respondents represent the national secretariat/coordinating unit (5), PRSP working group (6), ministry (5), expatriate consultant (2), national statistics office (2), civil society, non-governmental organization (1 each).

Individuals who responded to the RMC email survey
Peter Ssentongo, Uganda
Said M. Muhammed, Tanzania
Hassan Khamis Juma, Tanzania/Zanzibar
Mohamed H. Rajab, Tanzania/Zanzibar
Ameir Sheha, Tanzania/Zanzibar
Yousouph Dibba, Gambia
Davie Nicko Chunga, Malawi
N Dinga, Republic of Congo
Doungoupou Gervais Magliore, CAR
Zami Moise, CAR
Sani Yakoubou Mahaman, Niger

\(^8\) Contact names came from country economists and site visits representing 13 countries; snowball sampling from initial contacts resulted in 6 additional names.
### SURVEY RESULTS (Selected)

**RMC Survey**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In which of the following activities are you currently involved (n=11)</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development of the national Monitoring and Evaluation system</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination/management of the monitoring and evaluation system</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator development</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey and/or census implementation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine data collection</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory poverty assessments</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty impact analysis</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis and interpretation</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report preparation of M&amp;E findings</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications and dissemination of M&amp;E information</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil society participation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation studies</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### # of activities by individual (n=11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of activities</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Length of time working in M&E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of time</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-6 mo</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 mo-1 year</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 years</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 3 years</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gaps in PRSP M&E. Data from the surveys were triangulated with the data from the site visit interviews and the desk review to identify the top ten issues as reported in Table 3 in the text. Some variation is noted between RMC response and economist response.

### Gaps or problems affecting country’s PRSP M&E (check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RMC response (n=11)</th>
<th>Economist response (n=19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership commitment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of a common M&amp;E language, framework, approach</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination among organizational units and administrative entities, reporting structures, partners, funders</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and skill in methods and practice of monitoring</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and skills in methods and practice of evaluation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand for credible, trustworthy data (valuing M&amp;E)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder engagement in M&amp;E, including civil society participation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear goals; prioritized outcomes to monitor and evaluate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical, targeted performance indicators</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement and data collection that provides timely, useful data</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination of data collection</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful analysis and interpretation relevant for different users</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications and reporting that are user-friendly</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization of M&amp;E information in decision making, resource allocations, budgeting, program improvement</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives that promote results-based management and M&amp;E</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of technologies for processing and analyzing data</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Most useful topics for training of national level staff (select three)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># RMC response (n=11)</th>
<th># Economist response (n=19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building a M&amp;E system for results-based accountability; structures; processes; promising practices</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging stakeholders; civil society participation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results chain, program logic, logic model/logframe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turning vague goals into measurable outcomes; choosing outcomes to measure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance indicators: selection and measurement of process and short-medium-long term outcome indicators and impact indicators</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting baselines and targets</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection methods: promising practices in quantitative and qualitative methods, rapid assessment techniques; participatory approaches</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis and interpretation of data: strategic sense making; limitations of data; user-oriented analysis</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting and dissemination of data; user-friendly ways to report and share information to various audiences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of M&amp;E information in policy development, planning, resource allocation decisions, budgeting, program improvement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact assessment; causal questions of development effectiveness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustaining a M&amp;E system</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXPERIENCE WITH EVALUATION CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT

African Development Bank Experience

1. Since 1998, OPEV has been involved in evaluation capacity development in Africa. As a strategic priority for OPEV, building M&E capacity within RMCs links directly to ADB’s broader 2003-2007 Strategic Plan with emphasis on development effectiveness. The OPEV listing of activities includes:

1998, Abidjan. High level seminar organized jointly with the World Bank and held under the auspices of the DAC/OECD. Twelve African countries and 21 international aid institutions participated. Participants stressed that developing M&E capacity in African countries is essential for improving governance. They highlighted the need to:

- Create an African Association for Evaluation;
- Reinforce institutional support for the continent;
- Provide training in evaluation design, methodology and practice;
- Create a database of evaluators, lessons learned and best practices.


2000, Johannesburg. High level seminar and workshop organized jointly with the World Bank and Development Bank of South Africa. Participants included 56 participants from 11 African countries and 32 from donor agencies. Participants stressed the usefulness of the M&E in economic reform, good governance and sound development through preparation of PRSPs. Common themes that emerged from this meeting included the need for training; need for common M &E standards; distribution of responsibilities among agencies and associations; power of networking among societies and associations; need to use existing capacities and link M&E activities to current national strategies. Representatives from aid agencies committed themselves to helping strengthen national evaluation associations and networks; address training gaps in M&E with scholarships, fellowships, and other capacity building programs; develop databases of local consultants; and emphasize learning-oriented evaluation. A 251 page seminar proceeding was produced that is available online.

2005, Tunis. High-level regional seminar on Development Evaluation organized jointly with JAI in partnership with the Operations Evaluation Departments of the World Bank and IFC, and with the Public Service Commission (PSC) of South Africa. Forty-three senior officials from 25 African countries participated. The five-day event introduced key concepts, approaches and methodologies used in development evaluation to decision makers and evaluators in RMCs. Resulting planned activities included: joint annual delivery of a regional development evaluation seminar in Africa; establishment of a mobile M&E facility; adaptation of M&E approaches and development of a more consolidated approach; emphasis on self-sufficiency (ADB, May 2005)
2. OPEV also builds evaluation capacity within the Bank itself and within African institutions through dissemination of evaluation results; integration of results-based accountability in its own work (modeling good practice); and through its interactions with African colleagues at conferences and meetings; and maintaining a web site of resource materials for information exchange and learning.

3. Today, multiple factors have emerged to place priority on ECD: results-orientation of the PRSs; linkage between PRSPs and the HIPC debt relief initiative; Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) with measurable indicators and results; international focus on results-based management; civil society demand; imperatives for capacity building in Africa (Harmonization and emphasis on results reporting). A 2001 review of World Bank Development Effectiveness found weak M&E a contributing factor to poor project performance in 38 percent of Bank projects that were rated unsatisfactory of highly unsatisfactory (MacKay, 2002: 6). The multi-lateral banks as well as borrowing countries, as well as all public institutions, are under fire to both demonstrate and measure results and effectiveness.

Other Donors

4. In 1996, the DAC Expert Group on Aid Evaluation, OECD, commissioned a study to assess donor support to and experience with evaluation capacity building including a literature review and donor survey covering 26 agencies (Schaumburg-Muller, 1996). A current assessment with identification of lessons learned and areas for collaboration would seem warranted.

5. Donors have been supporting and involved in ECD for four decades. UNDP and USAID were early supporters beginning in the 1960’s. The USAID logframe of the early 1960’s is the predecessor of today’s logframes/logic models/results frameworks. Much of the early effort consisted of scattered activities with little emphasis on consistent policies or strategies for building national evaluation systems. Most were donor-driven to address their own project management and accountability needs. Almost every bi-lateral and multi-lateral agency and international NGOs established evaluation units to meet their own agendas. Country activities, if they existed, largely were tied to donor evaluation activities, dependent on aid financing.

6. A marked change has occurred in recent years driven by the demand for accountability and good governance. The development banks, in particular, have been active in supporting ECD as a function of their commitment to institution-building, capacity-building and public sector reform. Most have explicit policies related to ECD included in the mandates of their evaluation departments or other program departments.

7. Evaluation capacity development activities typically include:
   - training (in-country, regional, and overseas): short-term; long-term
   - technical assistance personnel (short-term; long-term)
   - equipment
   - conferences/seminars
   - study tours
   - joint evaluation
   - diagnostic work
   - scholarships/sponsorships
   - resource development
   - resource sharing (e.g., through web sites and knowledge centers)
   - identification of and financing consultants
   - network development; networking
   - support of national/international evaluation associations
8. Resources invested by donors vary greatly. ECD may involve specialized support for a designated M&E activity to more general involvement with the development assistance effort. Financial support may cover a single conference or purchase of equipment to long-term consultant support or over-time “high intensity” support to individual countries as practiced by the World Bank.

9. Little information exists on strengths and weaknesses of the various ECD approaches across donors: what works; what doesn’t; in which contexts; why? In the case of joint evaluations, the experience seems mixed depending in large part upon how the joint evaluation was formulated and practiced. Joint evaluations may do little to build national capacity when the country contribution is limited and even may be counterproductive given difficulties in reaching common conclusions agreeable to both parties. The lesson seems to be to ensure that joint evaluations enjoy a genuine participatory approach, where the needs and expectations of all parties are clearly articulated at start-up and ECD is explicitly and specifically taken into account. The same could be said for any type of joint effort based on partnering and collaboration.

10. With the largest evaluation office in the development community, the World Bank has been most active in M&E capacity development. Part of OED’s mandate since 1986, ECD has been an evolving strategy with the emphasis since FY04 on mainstreaming – the integration of evaluation methods and practice into organizational operations. A number of Bank units are involved including Operations Policy and Country Services (OPCS) that provides catalytic support to country teams that work with borrowers to strengthen country M&E, the World Bank Institute (WBI) that provides M&E and PRSP training, Development Economics Vice-Presidency (DEC) and Regional Units working on statistical capacity building, and OED with its long-standing support for ECD (Mackay, 2002). Of the Regions, Africa is the most active in country-level ECD given the concentration of HIPIC countries in Africa and imperative for capacity building. Given this experience, the Bank has accrued numerous lessons learned on ECD and has committed to provide annual reports to CODE on progress and results (Mackay, 2002) that will provide additional information and promising practices. In terms of PRSP M&E capacity development, a number of Bank units are providing capacity building efforts in PRSP M&E: the African Region Results and Learning Group (responds to country demands); African Region Poverty Reduction and Economic Management Department (poverty monitoring group); the World Bank Institute’s Poverty and Growth Program; The Social Development Department; and the Independent Evaluation Group.

11. Key donors in African ECD include DFID with interests in public sector management and reform; UNDP and UNICEF with emphasis on poverty monitoring as a strategic priority area; DANIDA with support for national statistics offices and sector support; Canadian CIDA, the German Development Service (DED), the EU, the ADB and the World Bank. USAID provides support and training in relation to its own project management and accountability needs.

12. There appears to be minimal formal coordination or strategic priority setting among the various donors related to country-level ECD. Planning and coordination may exist on-the-ground depending upon local circumstances and relationships. A variety of activities seem to be at play. The move towards harmonization and in particular, harmonization in reporting, could be expected to stimulate more coordination in ECD (OED/DAC Harmonization around Results Reporting, 2005).

---

Mainstreaming ECD

13. **Mainstreaming** is the integration of evaluation into the daily routines of organizations to promote learning and accountability (Barnette and Sanders, 2003). Increasingly, over the past decade the inadequacies of isolated trainings or episodic efforts to build evaluation capacity have been realized. Rather, if evaluation is to take hold and fulfill its promise as a management tool, a mechanism for learning and accountability, then it must become part of the organization’s fabric. Typical activities include (1) internal ECD (professional development of staff and institution building to support and promote ECD such as incentives, supports and structures); (2) external ECD (encouraging and supporting evaluation among client organizations – training others, providing technical assistance and support); and (3) research and development (bringing research to bear and developing resource materials). Evaluation capacity building is viewed as a package of activities that involve technical and institution building features for internal and external environments.

**Expected Results from ECD – what will success look like?**

14. The desired end result – expected outcomes – of ECD is when quality monitoring and evaluation information is used for decision making and learning. Mackay (2002:27) provides a vision of ECD in the development context:

- To inform government resource allocation decisions-policy-making and planning via national budgets and *Poverty Reduction Strategies* – by providing information on the likely benefits and costs of alternative policies, programs and projects.

- To support the design and ongoing management of activities (at sector, program and project levels), including government service delivery and the management of staff – this use is the learning function of M&E.

- To enhance transparency and support accountability relationships – accountability of government to parliament, to civil society and to donors, and to underpin accountability relationships within government (between sector ministries and central ministries, and between ministers, managers, and staff). Accountability is particularly important in the context of the HIPC initiative.

15. Evaluation material from CIDA on an institution-building project suggests the need to concentrate efforts at highest levels of authority in institutions concerned (Schaumburg-Muller, 1996). A 2004 OED report on its ECD indicates that countries that have received high- and medium- intensity support have made substantive ECD progress (OED, 2002:i). Where synergies are created among ECD activities at the country-level, results might be expected to be greatest.

**Lessons Learned in ECD**

16. Despite the early nature of much of the ECD work and lack of assessments, lessons are emerging:
• There is no standard approach. ECD must be tailored to local context, based on social, political, historical realities taking into account local assets and needs related to M&E in each country.
• Start simple.
• It takes a long time.
• There is need for high-level commitment; strong leadership; a “champion”
• Favorable preconditions include demand and readiness.
• Designate resources to ECD.
• Training is necessary but not sufficient; ongoing training necessary for building requisite skills and expertise.
• Clear roles, responsibilities, and accountabilities.
• Technologies must be available.
• Favorable preconditions exist, i.e., demand and readiness.\(^\text{10}\)
• Incentives that encourage and reward ECD embedded throughout the institution.

\(^{10}\) Diagnostic Guide and Action Framework (MacKay, 1999) provides checklists for assessing country capacity in order to tailor ECD to particular circumstances.
M&E TRAINING PROGRAMS

1. The following M&E training opportunities were compiled during the desk review in January 2006. Given the fugitive listings and changing availability of M&E training, this list should be considered as suggestive only.

2. Most of the M&E training targets member countries at either the national, local or project level. Some M&E training also targets staff within donor organizations to build individual and organizational skills in results-based M&E…part of mainstreaming and ensuring data availability.

3. A 2002 World Bank report (Mackay, 2002) reports 19 courses offered to Bank officials and others from borrower countries addressing M&E tools and techniques. The courses may be awareness building, basic or advanced skill building offerings. The Bank currently includes three core training programs in M&E capacity development:

   (1) Introduction to M&E (IME) – distance learning course offered via interactive videoconferencing (equivalent to about 4 days of training); responsibility of WBI; delivered in five languages.

   (2) Designing and Building Results-based M&E Systems; offered numerous times each year to Bank staff, government officials and civil society members. 2-3 day course. Materials available in French, Spanish, English, Russian, Arabic, and Portuguese.

   (3) International Program for Development Evaluation (IPDET) in collaboration with Carleton University in Ottawa; two-week core course (80 hours) plus 24 elective workshops. Elective workshops cover such topics as: Sampling; Shoestring Impact evaluation; Small-scale surveys; Focus Groups; Participatory M&E; Using Citizen Report Cards; Case study methods; Mixed methods; Cost-benefit analysis


5. Web sites of each of the International Professional Associations (AfrEA; IDEAS; IOCE) as well as the American Evaluation Association (http://www.eval.org) and the Canadian Evaluation Association (http://www.evaluationcanada.ca/) include listings of country and regional evaluation associations and lists of current training workshops and courses. For example, the Training Directory on the AfrEA web site (http://www.afrea.org/), lists 10 short courses and workshops for 2006 and three ongoing courses including a postgraduate diploma course and e-learning opportunities.
6. Individual donors conduct specialized trainings for project staff and member countries. For example, The MEASURE Evaluation Project, USAID funded project implemented by the Carolina Population Center, focuses on population, nutrition and health. In June 2006, in collaboration with the Centre Africain d'Etudes Superieures en Gestion (CESAG) in Dakar, Senegal, it will implement a three-week Francophone workshop, entitled Monitoring and Evaluation of Health Programs at the District Level: Practical Applications. The United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) http://www.unitar.org/dfm/General_Info/RegionalPartners.htm lists courses of related interest in such topics as economics and financial management.

7. National research and training institutions may conduct specialized M&E training or trainings on related topics. In Uganda, for example, the Makerere University has a strong tradition of economics, policy and social research provided by:

- Makerere Institute of Social Research (MISR)
- Economic Policy Research Center (EPRC)
- Centre for Basic Research (CBR)

8. Besides research, such institutes may be involved in capacity development and training. For example, several members of the MISR who attended the IPDET training in Ottawa have repurposed that training curriculum and provided it regionally in 2005. More managerial and vocational training is available at the Uganda Management Institute (http://www.umi.ac.ug/profile.php). A variety of M&E relevant short courses are available (see http://www.umi.ac.ug/courses.php).

Designated by the UN Economic Commission for Africa as The African Centre of Excellence in Management Development in May 1997
AFRICA AND INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION ASSOCIATIONS

Three professional organizations cover countries in Africa and play a role in M&E capacity development:

a) AfrEA (http://www.afrea.org/)
The African Evaluation Association was launched in 1999 in response to a growing demand for information sharing, advocacy and advanced capacity building in evaluation in Africa. It serves as an umbrella organization for national evaluation associations and networks in Africa and as a resource for individuals in countries where national bodies do not exist. It has facilitated the development of African Evaluation Guidelines to enhance the quality and utility of evaluation on the continent. A database of evaluators on the AfrEA Website highlights African evaluation expertise. In collaboration with UNIFEM an initiative is under way to enhance African capacity in gender and rights-based evaluation.

b) IDEAS (http://www.ideas-int.org)
Initially supported by OED and the UNDP’s Evaluation Office, this professional association was launched in September 2002 with a current broad membership representing individuals and organizations from developing and developed countries. The objectives of IDEAS are: to strengthen the development dimension of current evaluation associations, and to support the creation of country evaluation associations; to promote ECD; to inspire professional excellence in development evaluation; and to provide global knowledge, support and connectivity to development evaluation professionals. Its workplan includes such activities as sponsorship of collaborative events; high-level workshops and ECD seminars and possibly M&E training program.

c) IOCE International Organization for Cooperation in Evaluation (http://ioce.net/home/index.cfm?dv=1&lan=en)
The IOCE is an organization for networks and societies committed to building a worldwide evaluation community. It aims to be a platform for worldwide cooperation and partnership in evaluation, fostering the cross fertilization of ideas, high professional standards and an open and global perspective among evaluators.
Proposed Training Curriculum - Draft

Purpose: To strengthen monitoring and evaluation capacities in RMCs with special focus on PRSP indicator development

Target audience: Individuals of 1st and 2nd generation PRSP countries responsible for indicator development in PRSP M&E. Recommend two per country or country teams; possibly sector teams. Potential participants from: national secretariat; working groups; central and line ministries; local consultants; who have been hired to manage/coordinate the M&E system; others

Total number of participants: 20-30 (limit numbers to enhance sharing and application)

Content: Results-based M&E Systems; Results Chain; Indicator Development
Combine institutional aspects of M&E with skill building in indicator development. Discussion and practice of indicators must be set within context of the country PRSP and long-term strategy.

Location: To Be Determined

Duration: 1 week (40 hours learning/instruction)

Language of instruction: To Be Determined
Simultaneous translation is not advised when the content is complex and the instruction is based in practice. Expectation is that the training will be adapted for delivery in other language contexts.

Skill Level: Basic – intermediate level

Pedagogy: Experiential learning methods, discussion and sharing forums with strategic lectures and keynote addresses (pre and post workshop). Skill building sessions on impact indicators: hands-on applications using case materials (to be developed)

Design and implementation team: Two consultants, OPEV, JAI, ADI, RMC partners. Core team of 3-4 with administrative assistant to handle logistics. This design is very skeletal; an experienced workshop facilitator/instructional designer is needed to finalize the design and oversee implementation. Involve local partners in design and delivery of the training

Instructors and Facilitators: Considerations in selection: Technical subject matter expertise; M&E/RBM specialist; facilitation/adult learning expertise

11 While the training is designed with RMCs as target and user, the same or similar training program is recommended for relevant Bank staff in order to facilitate synergies between RMC M&E and Bank/CSP M&E.

12 The top learning needs identified during the training needs assessment.
Transfer of learning: Design strategies to ensure “transfer” of workshop learning; possibly included action planning throughout as well as on final day with follow-up at three and six months to monitor and discuss plan implementation.

Follow-up: Build in follow-up and ongoing learning opportunities; possibly a web listserv; web library/resource center; study tours, etc.

Participant Profile: Clear articulation of who should attend, expectations and desired training outcomes with specific attendance criteria.

Registration application: Request includes participant statement of purpose, related to the program content, and preliminary plan for transferring the training experience back in country.

Pre-workshop participant materials: Materials sent to participants: agenda, training goals; participant list; pre-workshop preparation; logistics/travel information; etc. Materials requested from participants: personal learning goals; pre-training assessment of M&E in country (to be developed).

Training Resources: To be developed; reuse intended (possibly web use).

Certificate of Participation or Credential

Evaluation of the Training Program: Conference evaluation, process evaluation (“roving reporters” or focus groups) and 6 month follow-up evaluation

Goals, Expected Outcomes, Logic Model13 - Goals:

1. to increase knowledge and skills in M&E relevant to PRSP implementation within regional member countries;

2. to design a training program that will help ensure that knowledge gained at training is used/integrated in trainees’ organizations;

3. to create a curriculum that has ongoing use;

4. to promote knowledge sharing related to promising practices in PRSP M&E.

---

13 Logic models, logframes, results chains are formatted in a variety of ways. See Appendix. The World Bank and USAID often use a vertical format. The horizontal format illustrated here relates to an online instructional course developed by the author (www.uwex.edu/ces/lmcourse).
DAY 1: BUILDING A RESULTS-BASED M&E SYSTEM FOR PRSP

Purpose: to cover and reinforce basic concepts of results-based management

Content: Reinforce development of a shared vision and shared methodology for results measurement; clarify confusing terminology/vocabulary; emphasize results orientation of PRSPs; link M&E to results-based management; examine exemplary cases

Process: Build upon World Bank course, Designing and Building Results-based M&E Systems, with materials in French, English, and Portuguese. Also, IPDET session: Designing and building results-based M&E system (Ray Rist); Incorporate exemplary case examples

Practice: Country experiences: process, issues
DAY 2: RESULTS FRAMEWORK

Purpose: to embed M&E within a results framework that serves country decision making

Content: basic aspects of results frameworks/results chains with examples; examine promising practices; issues involved; how to build results frameworks/chains for projects, programs, and complex national systems (simple to complex results framework); linking project to country PRSP level in coherent system; basing M&E on what policy makers really need to know; linking activities, policy actions, results, and budget decision making with M&E

Process: Mini-lecture and discussion using source materials
Country experience
Case examples
Practice

DAY 3 AND 4: INDICATOR DEVELOPMENT

Purpose: to provide practice in selection and measurement of indicators along a results chain aligned with the country PRSP

Content: key, practical, relevant indicators along a results-chain, with emphasis on the “missing middle” in context of country PRSPs; examination of common indicators; value and process of country-driven indicator development – who involved/how accomplished; prioritizing and limiting number of indicators

Process: Participating country PRSPs – existing indicators
Hands-on, small group work
Case method

DAY 5: ACTION PLANNING

Morning:
Share discussions and learning from track discussions of previous two days

Action Planning
As country teams, participants finalize their plans for application of workshop materials in home country. Action Plan template to be distributed providing structure for this activity. SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunity and Threats) analysis of action plan to be completed

Afternoon: Country teams present Action Plans. Discussion and sharing

Wrap-up and Next Steps
## Figure 3. MENU OF SOME ECD OPTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRONG SUPPLY</th>
<th>DEMAND</th>
<th>WEAK SUPPLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strong</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• support evaluation of policies, programs and projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• establish links between evaluation, strategic planning, resource allocation and budgets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• use expert commissions to evaluate policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• strengthen evaluation in the legislature (parliament)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• disseminate evaluation results to the public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• organize and systematize the evaluation function</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• support financial and information (monitoring) systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• disseminate lessons of experience and evaluation best practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• set up commissions to evaluate important projects or programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• train and use private sector organizations in evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• support university training in evaluation, including via short courses or seminars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• provide technical assistance to government agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• build an evaluation network within government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• promote evaluation by NGOs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• introduce evaluation standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weak</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• disseminate evaluation methods and practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• support ongoing evaluation of programs and projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• participate in evaluations done by external funding agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• support professional development in evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• support research institutions in carrying out evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• build an evaluation network within government and/or regionally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• organize ECD seminars for senior officials, to help build consensus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• mandate evaluation by decrees, regulations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• strengthen audit and accounting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• carry out joint evaluations with funding agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• disseminate national and international lessons of experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• support evaluation training in educational institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• promote cross-country cooperation in evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• raise awareness among decision makers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>