Annex 2: Detailed notes on the four programmes

1. Analysis of M&E Framework, Business Sector Programme Support, Tanzania

Analytic questions	Desk analysis	Interview statements
1. How has the M&E framework improved the evaluability of the programme?		
1a. SMART indicators	Indicators were further developed during a M&E consultancy. A balance between SMART and availability: "higher levels of the logical framework, data availability is a serious constrain so the indicators have been identified based on the data available, which could be easily obtained rather than what was most ideal and desirable" (COWI). Not all indicators in the logframe are SMART (quantified targets). On subcomponent level (outcome) no figures are stated making it difficult to assess whether targets are met or not. However, annual targets are found in sub-component progress reports, which reduce the problem. *Sub-component A.2 Objective (BEST-AC): all indicators are smart.* *Sub-component A.3.b objective (TUCTA): all indicators are smart.* *Sub-component B.1 Objective (MITM): No indicators are mentioned (in the report available).* *Sub-component B..2 (FCM): Only indicators on activity level.* Sub-component C1/C2/C3 + *A.3.a (ATE)*: only quarterly/semi-annual report from 2009 or 2010 available and the indicators are unclear and very descriptive and only on activity or output levels.	There were no monitoring on programme outcome/impact level but only on component and sub-component level. The state auditors were only interested in the program level and the programme had little to show. The consultant elevated the sub-component indicators to become proxy indicators on component level. There are only a few programme and component indicators and they do not logically cover all sub-components. Therefore, the theory of change between sub-components, component and programme levels was not consistent. The M&E system established is by far most useful on sub-component level and not on programme level. In BSPS 2, the system was based on the RDEs needs. In phase 3, it is based more on partners' needs.
1b. Baselines	Overall: Partly *Sub-component A.2 Objective (BEST-AC): yes* *Sub-component A.3.b objective (TUCTA): yes* *Sub-component B.1 Objective (MITM): No* Sub-component C1/C2/C3 + *A.3.a (ATE)*: as above (SMART indicators)	

Analytic questions	Desk analysis	Interview statements
1c. Impact monitoring	Sequential reporting on outcome and impact level pr component was planned but not succesful <u>*Sub-component A.2 (BEST-AC):*</u> *Got a report from the first 3 years (up to 2011) on outcome level (highest levels in sub-components). It is very thorough and it is done by consultants. A baseline was also produced (longitudal M&E)* <u>*Sub-component A.3.b (TUCTA):*</u> *Got a report for the first year (dec. 2010) + a baseline on outcome level.* <u>*Sub-component B.1 (MITM):*</u> *No reporting on outcome and impact level (in the report available) – 2010/11* <u>*Sub-component B.2 (FCM):*</u> *No reporting on outcome and impact level (in the report available) – 2008/09-2010/11* <u>Sub-component C1/C2/C3 + *A.3.a (ATE)*:</u> only quarterly report/semi-annual from 2009 or 2010 available and it is not concerned with the impact level <u>FSCT:</u> A review report suggested that activities are done (1 mill. loans) but also that it is inadequate in order to reach the objectives since population growth is bigger than persons who get access to loan. Additionally, a methodology to undertake an impact assessment of BEST-AC was produced in 2010, and the first annual report was out in 2011. It examines some of the outcome and impact indicators of the sub-component. It is undertaken by external consultants and is based on a theory of change methodology. Two sub-components have produced data on impact and outcome level whereas the other sub-components have not (at least in the material available).	*- Sub-component A.2 Objective (BEST-AC): have they continued producing such reports for the subsequent two years? Yes!* *- Have they continued producing such reports for the subsequent two years? Yes!* *- Maybe subsequent reports are better – do they exist?* *- As above* *- As above* - They hired a short term consultant to assist them with the outcome and impact level M&E but the work was not useful.
1d. Output monitoring	Yes	
1e. Targets on all the relevant levels of the logframe	See under the question "SMART indicators"	
1f. Which levels are progress reported on and how?	It varies from sub-component to sub-component. See above under impact and output monitoring.	
2. How has the M&E framework been used during	-	-

Analytic questions	**Desk analysis**	**Interview statements**
implementation?		
2a. by programme management	?	Progress reports and systems established on sub-component level worked well in order to follow progress on especially activity level and local managers got the necessary data. But we don't know much about the progress on component and programme level. There are no progress reports on component and programme levels except in the master monitoring matrix but a lot of indicators are missing. even here The Danish State auditors wanted to see results on outcome/impact level for the programme but this level was poorly monitored. Focus was on the sub-components.
2b. by the Embassy		As above since (Mikkel was/Sam is diplomat at the embassy). RDE have meetings with partners based on the reports. However, it was clear that e.g. TUCTA has trained a lot of people but TUCTA does not know what the trainings leads to on higher levels. The RDE wants to focus more on lessons learned in the future.
3. Was the programme logframe reformulated in the inception phase?	We know from the documents that it was suggested but not whether it was actually done.	It was reformulated but not significantly.
4. Was the logframe conducive or a hindrance to establishing a good M&E system?		It was conducive but it would have been better to adjust it more during implementation. E.g. some targets should have been adjusted and programme and component indicators/targets were too far from sub-component. But it is easier for the programme management to stick to the first logframe so that discussions about what funds can be used for are not opened up all the time. - TUCTA and another partner did not work with logframes but only their own strategic plans. - The theory of change in the logframe was not always clear, especially how sub-components and components contributed to programme objectives. The components were of such a different nature that it was difficult to construct a logical theory of change on programme level.
5. What were the data sources used to collect monitoring information?	Existing international and national statistical sources supplemented with various surveys incl. member surveys.	
5a. Which national	Multiple - See COWI report Annex 1.	It became a problem that the programme had to

Analytic questions	Desk analysis	Interview statements
sources of data were used?		stick to the existing national MoV, because this influenced the formulation of indicators and to some extent also objectives and outputs.
5b. Were primary data collected by the M&E responsible?	To some extent (survey on level of member satisfaction etc.)	
6. What was the organizational set-up?	-	
6a. staffing	A part time consultant	The partners also have staff responsible for M&E
6b. anchorage	The system focused on improving partners existing systems more than establishing a M&E framework on programme level "The Review Team agrees that this management and monitoring system fulfils the needs of RDE and Danida, but it is not obvious how Tanzanian ownership of BSPS III is ensured." (review)	- In the permanent organisations (MIS, TUCTA, the University, employers union) the consultant build M&E systems based on the organisations' own strategic goals and plans. - It enhances the M&E agenda when the RDE tells the organisations to strengthen the systems and gives them consultancy aid.
6c. Who were they reporting to?	Donors + relevant ministries	
7. What is the cost in terms of man-hours or consultancy fees in establishing the system?	It has only been possible to get the consultancy expenditures and not partner M&E expenditures. The cost from 2006-10 (two phases): Fees DKK 1,594,200 Reimbursables DKK 153,685 TOTAL DKK 1,747,885 This equals 0,22 % of the total programme budget (775.000.000 DKK)	Lesson learned: Spend more on M&E incl. more on surveys and support to the partners. Former programme manager: "*It was a giant help to have the consultants making the M&E system because you are fully occupied with meetings etc. The consultant can keep focus.*" Programme officer: "*The RDE did not have resources to do the M&E on programme level. Did and still do not have the required time. In the next phase (from Feb. 2014), there will be a consultant assisting the partners to continue running their systems as well as monitoring the programme level, undertake M&E analysis on this level, write the reports and make baselines for new sub-components in the new phase.*"
8. What is the cost in terms of man-hours or consultancy fees in maintaining the system?	Maintaining the system was not included in the ToR.	Data must be collected from the partners.
9. Assessment of ToR with M&E consultancies	Good quality. They include M&E of the outcome level.	
10. The system is documented	Yes, to some extent in the Planning and monitoring manual and the Monitoring Matrix (COWI).	
11. Focus on methodological learning	Not found in the documents.	Very little. The M&E system was not sufficiently learning oriented. Focus is on documentation. and it is better to spend time on learning through studies. However, surveys are expensive but we learnt most from a tracer study costing 600.000

Analytic questions	Desk analysis	Interview statements
		DKK. We could tell the University that had done certain training for a long time – the courses are not sustainable. Subsequently, they were changed. For the new phase it will be suggested to set aside more funds for learning purposes. We will also suggest to set aside funds for impact evaluation - the Rolls Royce model). In the future: need for studies of e.g. why it worked one and not in another place.
12. Is it still in use? Why not?		Yes, on sub-component level. But some sub-components are not reporting timely and need to be reminded to do so.
13. Challenges	Gender issues are not considered (review) "The challenge remains lack of systemic collection of data, analysis and using of the information generated from the established M&E systems" <u>Sub-component BEST-AC:</u> "Almost all the data and information necessary to determine the indicators of the log frame are collected by BEST-AC which is rather time consuming. The PSOs don't play a proactive role in providing BEST-AC with the data and information. By improving the quality of PSO reporting, they could have a more pro-active role in the generating of monitoring data."	- It is a challenge to make the logframes and result chains based on theory of change and not on the organisations' existing activities and approaches. In e.g. component 1 there are 4 sub-components, which are so different that it does not make sense to work with an overarching objective. At the same time, there is a focus on the Paris Declaration and partners received a kind of core funding. ATE's strategic plan and not a MfA logframe was in focus. - It was a mistake to develop indicators based on the existing MoV available instead of developing MoV, which suited the theory of change's indicators (e.g. surveys). The MoV came to govern the theory of change and not visa versa. How will that work when we build country based systems (and not sector focus)? We are still working on the Ministry of industry and trade – it is based on a logframe. However, their work is very generic and you will never be able to come to SMART indicators. It is not a priority in the government

2. Analysis of M&E Framework, Business Sector Programme Support, Kenya

Analytic questions	Desk analysis	Interview
1. How has the M&E framework improved the evaluability of the programme?	Too early to say conclusively. The M&E consultancy started 15. October 2012 and the first reports on programme level generated by the system are not out yet. However, the consultant is setting up a system focusing on outcome and impact levels, and the system will be able to provide evaluation relevant data. "The RT finds it encouraging that a robust M&E system now seems to be in place and it is of utmost importance that collection of data including necessary baseline studies are initiated as soon as possible. Hopefully, the first (probably incomplete) aggregated results report of BSPS II can be available during the 3rd quarter of 2013 (covering the first half year of 2013) and the first complete results report be available during the first quarter of 2014." (from Review report)	Have the partners generated reports based on their existing systems? Yes, but no results oriented programme report. The reports are on their way in the indicator template on results levels. The consultants do not know the quality but they fear the worst.
1a. SMART indicators	On programme level the indicators are generally speaking SMART - see M&E Matrix and the M&E INITIAL ASSESSMENT REPORT. However, no targets and timing pr. indicator are set (at least in these documents). On component/sub-component level the consultant/partners are in the process of making the indicators SMART. Example of a challenge in sub-comp 1.1: "Poor differentiation between outcomes and outputs. Poor differentiation between the levels and logic of the LFM" (COWI rep). → The components LFMatixes should be updated.	Is that still the case? What about indicators on output and activity level in the components? How far has this exercise progressed? It is still in progress.
1b. Baselines	"During the inception period of BSPS II relevant baseline data will be gathered for all components and sub-components." – This was not done. A reporting matrix has been distributed to all partners to fill in baseline data and their work should be on its way.	Progress?: • The baseline has not yet been done and implementation has taken place for two years. • BUT: The partners have been asked to give baseline data in a matrix developed by the consultant. It is not received yet. The first results report will focus on this. In the next report the partners will be asked to set targets based on the baseline. • They will also be asked about status before programme start, to avoid implementation "contaminating" data • More time should be set aside in the programme formulation phase so that what the partners are already collecting/what is possible to collect is

Analytic questions	Desk analysis	Interview
		included in the programme document. The formulation missions should include an M&E consultant ensuring that the baseline data can be collected by the partners.
1c. Impact monitoring	Not done yet. Will be undertaken by contracted consultants.	-
1d. Output monitoring	The responsibility of programme partners.	Any reports available? Not yet.
1e. Targets on all the relevant levels of the logframe	No – but on its way →	Targets will be included in the second progress report in the "monitoring matrix for data management".
1f. Which levels are progress reported on and how?	No reports available yet on programme level – they will be semi-annual.	Partner reports not according to the template and they are still very activity level focused.
2. How has the M&E framework been used during implementation?	-	-
2a. by programme management	Too early to say.	-
2b. by the Embassy		The M&E process has helped the RDE to understand that the sub-components logframes are not contributing to the theory of change in a logical way. RDE can follow the implementation process via the narrative activity progress reports but only follow progress on results levels to a limited extent (not systematic related to indicators).
3. Was the programme logframe reformulated in the inception phase?	No logframe in programme document on programme level and component documents are not received Maybe that is one of the reasons why there is little ownership to the objective on programme level (missing links in theory of change)?	The component level and objectives on programme level elements have not been changed. The sub-component objectives were changed a lot - in a participatory process.
4. Was the logframe conducive or a hindrance to establishing a good M&E system?	No logframe in the programme doc. "COWI: the rationale in the hierarchy of objectives is missing in some cases. i.e. the sub-components/components do not clearly contribute to the result chain of the programme, or the programme objective. For some, e.g. component 3, the component objective (in the programme document) reads as two activities" (RT). Options: "1) Do nothing. Continue with the ToR assumption that the logic of the BSPS II Programme holds. This will result in the creation of development Objective, Component	Which model did you end up using out of the five ("to be decided by RT when M&E system is in place in April/May")? "We ended up working on option 3".

Analytic questions	Desk analysis	Interview
	Objective and Sub-component Objective indicators in isolation, with little relationship to one another and major problems of attribution for the programme objective as a whole. 2) Review and revise component objectives on the basis of sub-component inputs, with a view to increasing their relevance to both the sub-components and the programme as a whole. This will entail some adjustment to the levels and language of the BSPS II component log-frames, but will not fundamentally alter the programme structure, or its ultimate objectives. However, this may entail that critical elements for the achievement of job-creation and employment benefits, such as infrastructure, remain outside of the BSPS II programme logic. 3) Allow for outcome areas to emerge more “organically”, so-called “late-linking”, from the actual work and data collection efforts of the sub-components. While these outcome areas, or “dimensions of change” may not relate completely with the logical hierarchy of the BSPS II Logical Framework Matric (LFM), they are more relevant to the sub-components and would give ultimately a more accurate reflection of BSPS II achievements. This would not necessarily require alteration to the current LFM, but would exist in parallel and complement it and could eventually form into a theory of change for BSPS II; a process and relationship between theories of change and outdated LFMs being already very familiar to both TMEA and REACT. 4) Complement the existing component objectives with a few others that are critical to the development objective of employment generation, where all or at least some of the sub-components are making a major contribution and that can be measured, though not necessarily in a harmonised way. 5) Some partners have even suggested adjust the development objective. However, revision at this level would fundamentally alter the rationale of the programme and would not be recommended. In addition, it does not mean	

Analytic questions	Desk analysis	Interview
	that a more meaningful and measurable development objective could be identified for the diverse sub-components."	
5. What were the data sources used to collect monitoring information?	"The M&E will a.o. be carried out using information available within BSPS II components, surveys to be undertaken and third party data sources".	-
5a. Which national sources of data were used?	A long range of local/national sources. See M&E Matrix.	-
5b. Were primary data collected by the M&E responsible?		Balance between these sources? They are going to use as many existing local and national sources as possible.
6. What was the organizational set-up?	"Programme level M&E will be undertaken by an independent and experienced contractor. Focus will be on the degree to which the BSPS II is contributing towards reaching the development objective as well as the immediate objectives... KEPSA will be responsible for aggregating the sub-component and component data on a regular basis enabling the PSC, being responsible for programme level M&E, to make informed decisions. M&E at output level will be carried out by the respective component implementing partners. TMEA and the AECF have their own monitoring framework and set-up." The focus is only: "timely and accurate management information in relation to outcome and impact of the BSPS II supported interventions. M&E activities at component output levels will be carried out by the respective component and sub-component management teams or otherwise within their respective monitoring structures" (RT).	Do the components/sub-components have their own M&E staff? Some have and some not. COWI is not doing the M&E but supporting KEPSA to do it. KEPSA is becoming the weak link in the whole setup. KEPSA can only do its job well if the partners report well. RDE needs to use both stick and carrot e.g. put pressure on partners when reports are not delivered timely. Is it better to employ a M&E officer in KEPSA? "We don't know".
6a. staffing	See above.	Partners have some inhouse M&E capacity.
6b. anchorage	The system is mainly a donor based system but some capacity building in partner organisations takes place.	
Who were they reporting to?	To early to say since reports are scares at this point in time.	
7. What is the cost in terms of man-hours or consultancy fees in establishing the system?		- Programme budget: 320.000.000 DKK - No fixed budget in the programme document for M&E. They can go up to 5 mill. DKK. for M&E incl. studies. - Consultant (COWI): 500.000 DKK - CAC (partner M&E system): 500.000 DKK - Later, RDE will pay an M&E expert for KEPSA

Analytic questions	Desk analysis	Interview
		(work on programme M&E): 250.000-500.000. - Partners can ask for M&E funds but most are not doing it. So far spent approximately: 1 mill. DKK, which equals 0,003 % of total budget. If 5 mill DKK will be spent by end of programme it equals 1,5 % of total budget.
8. What is the cost in terms of man-hours or consultancy fees in maintaining the system?		Trademark Africa: They spend more than 10 % of their budget (used other budgetlines).
9. Assessment of ToR with M&E consultancies	Fine quality. However, not as elaborate as the Tanzania ToR. The latter include the following additional elements: - "assisting the partners to appreciate the importance and need of having and using an effective and efficient M&E systems" - "Assess the partners existing system and agree with the partners any changes" - Training of local partners" Recommendation: Combine the two sets of ToR. If the baseline and M&E system are to be initiated in the inception phase the M&E consultancy should be initiated at the very early stages of the inception phase.	Any comments? The large difference is that in Tanzania reporting on programme level was weaker but stronger to the partners How much is Danida willing to use on M&E? The original ToR were unrealistic (we have received the adjusted ToR): The magnitude of the job was bigger than anticipated. We can design the system and give advise but not do the ToR nor do the studies (randomized approach).
10. The system is documented		They are working on a draft – a draft was ready in May but has not been approved yet.
11. Focus on methodological learning		Not a strong focus. It is an accountability system. But some learning takes place during partners' meetings e.g. discussing theory of change (eye opening for the partners). Studies are more focused on impact than learning.
12. Is it still in use? Why not?		Yes – actually it is in the process of "kicking off"
13. Challenges	"It is a concern to the RT that the M&E system was not designed and put into operation during the Inception Phase of BSPS II, as was envisaged in the Programme Document. At this point of time the first round of collection of data including baselines is still to be done – and (revised) targets are consequently not yet formulated. The longer time it takes to collect baselines, the more difficult it is to define these and get realistic measures of impact." (RT) A number of adjustments have to be made in	- To build on partners' systems. In the Kenya programme it is assumed that the partners have the required M&E capacity – unlike in Tanzania programme. - Inadequate resources allocated to M&E. It requires a lot of resources to set up the systems and the partners have not set this aside. - Some programme (Danida) objectives do not match partners' original objectives but they "play along". There is less ownership to these objectives and the related monitoring. Especially the ownership to the programme development

Analytic questions	Desk analysis	Interview
	order for the theory of change to become logical.	objective is weak. The attribution is almost meaningless – the theory of change does not hold. E.g. employment creation – only two partners can meaningfully report on this. - An indicator-based system is not looking at the unforeseen positive/negative outcomes. Some impact is not captured when you are only looking at predefined indicators. Therefore, the M&E system will also include qualitative case studies. However, the two approaches (open studies and indicator-based M&E) complement each other. - Invalid information since data from partners cannot be compared. - We sense partner ownership on sub-component objective level but not on component and programme level. - Randomised M&E (impact evaluation) is not possible with the resources available. - Helen: The biggest challenge is to relate / attribute the sub-component outcomes to the programme development objective (employment).

3. Analysis of M&E Framework, Uganda Good Governance Programme (Democratic Governance Facility)

Analytic questions	Desk analysis	Interview
1. How has the M&E framework improved the evaluability of the programme (other than on the below parameters)?	-	- "This is not a sector programme as such but a multi donor pool funding programme".
1a. SMART indicators	Yes – rather detailed on output, outcome and impact levels already in programme document with a few exceptions.	On activity level too? Yes – indicators are found in partners' annual work-plans.
1b. Baselines	Baseline data is included in programme doc with a few exceptions. Subsequently, a relatively large-scale baseline survey was conducted and an updated overview of baseline data can be found in the annual report 2012/2013 (annex 5) in relation to most outcome/impact indicators. All relevant indicators are related to targets in final logframe.	
1c. Impact monitoring	See above.	-
1d. Output monitoring	See above.	-
1e. Targets on all the relevant levels of the logframe	Yes on all levels.	
1f. Which levels are progress reported on and how?	In the programme progress report progress is systematically reported on outcome/ impact level (not all indicators are covered) and more sporadically (narrative and case based) on activity and output levels.	On component / partner level? They focus on activity monitoring. This is an area of development. The programme asks them to try to focus on results level – slow progress. The M&E officer and possible staff (6) can assists them in improving this.
2. How has the M&E framework been used during implementation?	-	-
2a. by programme management		To report to RDE: For dialogue with partners re. their annual work-plans; no focus on outcome/impact levels yet.
2b. by the Embassy		As above.
3. Was the programme logframe reformulated in the inception phase?		The programme used a lot of time on revising the prog. doc. logframe in a participatory process. It was approved in Nov. 2012. Thereafter it was gender mainstreamed and a baseline was carried out. Final approval was 1. quarter 2012.
4. Was the logframe	A very comprehensive starting point which	Yes but it had to be substantially adjusted in order

Analytic questions	Desk analysis	Interview
conducive or a hindrance to establishing a good M&E system?	includes a long range of baseline values and targets.	to match program reality and to work as a foundation for the M&E framework. It has been a time consuming process but also necessary. It also created a common understanding of the programme among key stakeholders and realistic targets. It is important to supplement the logframe and analyse the programme context and what other players are doing. Based on that one can develop new strategies regarding what the programme should do and what others should do. The programme doc. analysis needs to be updated on a running basis.
5. What were the data sources used to collect monitoring information?	-	Have the external specialists mentioned in DGF strategy doc. undertaken the first effect and efficiency study? No. It will be done in 2014. The idea is to both identify outcome/impact results and also to identify a no. of focus areas and gaps for future programming.
5a. Which national sources of data were used?	Many incl. Afro-barometer Survey The M&E system is meant to supplement the National Development Plan M&E system and to a large extent build on it (Prog. sup. doc).	-
5b. Were primary data collected by the M&E responsible?	Yes, e.g. mini survey for component 1 and baseline survey.	-
6. What was the organizational set-up?		-
6a. staffing	At DGFacility there is one M&E officer.	- Any M&E staff in other parts of the programme? No, but they suggest to hire a manager to take care of M&E and communication and 6 facilitators to assist partners build among other things M&E capacity. More resources to the area are required. The M&E officer was not in the original program doc. No resources were set aside to this and it has been a struggle to get the resources to established a results and communication unit in the programme. - Did you hire an M&E consultant? No, an M&E officer. If you choose a consultant it should be one person continuous and over a longer period e.g. 2 years.
6b. anchorage		See above.
6c. Who were they reporting to?		Head of programme.
7. What is the cost in terms of man-hours or		Total M&E cost to date is 1.9% of total program costs. The overview does not include indirect costs in

Analytic questions	Desk analysis	Interview
consultancy fees in establishing the system?		terms of the time HOP, Component Managers, Program Staff and Accountants spend on M&E, including review and approval of partner reports, field visit monitoring, preparation of TORs and follow-up to consultancies, etc. and the direct costs of field visits. My guess is that if all of that were calculated the cost of M&E in DGF would increase to 4-5 % of total costs within DGF. Additionally the DGF is financing M&E undertaken by partners, and reflected in partner budgets and accounts. My guess is that if that were to be calculated, we would arrive at least 10% of total program costs.
8. What is the cost in terms of man-hours or consultancy fees in maintaining the system?		?
9. Assessment of ToR with M&E consultancies	No primary M&E consultant was hired but an M&E officer was employed to do the following: Relevant ToR but not as elaborate as consultant's ToR (Kenya and Tanzania) and the emphasis on outcome/impact monitoring is weak.	Any comments to their quality? No. Is it better to use consultants? No, consultants and M&E officers can create equally good results if the consultancy is long term and the same consultant participates through out the consultancy.
10. The system is documented	Format for partners' progress reporting has been produced. It focus mainly on output level but an annexed matrix also include the outcome and impact levels (Partner annual management report).	Not yet. They need to develop an M&E strategy and manual.
11. Focus on methodological learning	A results and communication unit was established in order to among other things "Strengthen the knowledge management and learning functions so as to improve organizational performance of DGF-partners and the DGF itself".	What is the status of this activity? This process has been started but a lot of work needs to be done yet. In the areas of civic education and legal aid centers of excellence are established. One partner is in charge of developing best practices comparing methodologies. They also develop standards for e.g. legal activities. A thematic evaluation of "the effectiveness of the capacity development support to partners' members" has been done, and one more evaluation is planned ("the gender mainstreaming programme"). The evaluations will be the basis for policy development.
12. Is it still in use? Why not?	Yes.	-

Analytic questions	Desk analysis	Interview
13. Challenges		What have been the main challenges in establishing and running the M&E system? - No resources were earmarked M&E in the programme document and it is difficult at a later date to channel the required amount of funds to the area. - HUGOU in Nepal was to a larger extend than the Ugandan programme based on a modality where implementing partners' objectives and systems are in focus instead of creating a programme and monitoring system partly for the donors. The Nepal alternative was a strategic partnership where donors core funds a strategic plan. A programme logframe becomes less important. No special reports on programme relevant progress is made by the partners. They only produce one progress report focusing on the organisations' general progress and results. However, this modality was not even in Nepal carried out in its totality. When it is, the partners avoid report to up to 5-10 donors, and thereby spending too much of their core staff's time on reporting. This approach only works if the partners' M&E, budgeting, planning etc. capacity is enhanced. In Uganda, the programme is still project oriented in its M&E approach. The longterm objective must be that the partners become more accountable to themselves: they find out what is important to know and how to get the data also on results levels.

4. Analysis of M&E Framework, HRGGP Nepal

Analytic questions	Desk analysis	Interview
1. How has the M&E framework improved the evaluability of the programme?	The overall M&E framework is of high quality (clear indicators, targets, baseline and MoV also on evaluation relevant levels) but no impact / outcome has been reported so far.	
1a. SMART indicators	<u>M&E Framework on programme level</u>: Indicators and targets exist on activity, output and outcome levels but not on impact (goal) level. <u>Partner M&E frameworks:</u> <u>AFP</u>: No impact indicators and targets; LFA relatively poor. <u>NNDSWO:</u> Indicators and targets on activity, output and outcome levels but not on impact (goal) level and some baseline values are not given. <u>INSEC:</u> Indicators and targets on activity, output and outcome levels but not on impact (goal) level. <u>CeLLARD:</u> Indicators and targets set for output and most outcomes but not on impact level. Some indicators are act. Level and not outcome level. <u>SAMAGRA:</u> Indicators and targets on activity, output and outcome levels but not on impact (goal) level. <u>NEMAF:</u> Indicators and targets on activity, output, outcome and impact levels (good quality). **<u>6 other partners</u>:** Not analysed since the frameworks are basically the same as above.	We do not have a systematic database (management information system), which is required. Data from progress reports are not inserted in a database. Reason: We do not have the resources. It is an informal system. Monitoring data on activity and output levels have no database. However, impact and outcome will be reported in ONE report (not founded in a database) – ok for an evaluation mission. Instead: Focus has been on strengthening the partners management capacity incl. M&E.
1b. Baselines	Done and data included in the M. framework.	Baseline conducted by 2010 for the whole programme (collection of secondary information and primary data both by a local company).
1c. Impact analysis	Latest progress report is 2012/2013 and it only reports on activity and output levels.	- Any report on outcome /impact levels? No. It will be included in the completion report. - Progress reports from partners are mostly on activity/output and only to a limited extent on outcome level. However, some information (indicators) are left blank (often no baseline data). - No report on outcome/impact on programme level yet.
1d. Targets on all the relevant levels of the logframe	Yes: See "SMART" indicators and M. Framework Except on impact level (dev. objective). On partner level the targets are set annually only.	-
2. How has the		

Analytic questions	**Desk analysis**	**Interview**
M&E framework been used during implementation?		
2a. by programme management		Management use monitoring visit reports and partner organisations' output reporting. E.g. are annual targets met? If not → re-planning and re-budgeting.
2b. by the Embassy		The embassy asks HUGOU for advise but do not go into any detail in the M&E reports.
3. Was the programme logframe reformulated in the inception phase?		Yes: Especially new development of indicators and MoV. See the monitoring framework and plans.
4. Was the logframe conducive or a hindrance to establishing a good M&E system?	Indicators and MoV on all levels but no targets (see below).	It was a good basis for preparing the M&E framework. Changes were made only on indicator and MoV level.
5. What were the data sources used to collect monitoring information?	-	-
5a. Which national sources of data were used?	"Since no measurable indicators or targets have been established in the TYIP for Democracy, Good Governance, Justice or Human Rights, the programme has developed its own indicators" E.g. Election Commission of Nepal database.	"To the extent possible, the HRGGP will rely on data collected by the Government, other development partners or international organisations such as the World Bank, UNDP, OHCHR and UNMIN. At times, however, it will be necessary to initiate stand alone data collection for monitoring purposes. This will include baseline data, and gender and ethnicity aggregated data." To what extent did this happen?: To a large extent
5b. Were primary data collected by the M&E responsible?	Yes (see above); various surveys.	-
6. What was the organizational set-up?	"HUGOU is responsible for all monitoring of HRGGP. It has supported the Strategic Partners in establishing their own systems, that include semi-annual strategic partnership meetings with all development partners who monitor progress, provide inputs to joint annual reviews and discuss issues and challenges. The overall monitoring of the other partners is undertaken in the steering committees and meetings".	Partners: Have an M&E focal person. Programme level: Partners were coached by the programme officer on M&E frameworks and baseline information. Frequent meetings and coaching (no formal training). Consultant: No – except for the baseline. Saved $ and local consultants do not always provide high quality products. However, it was time consuming to do it alone.
6a. staffing		See above.
6b. anchorage		Mainly anchored in the partner organisations. The M&E framework is related to GoN targets but

Analytic questions	Desk analysis	Interview
		the programme M&E system is not anchored in the GoN system.
6c. Who were they reporting to?		HUGOU and RDE
7. What is the cost in terms of man-hours or consultancy fees in establishing the system?		The total M&E cost for the five-year period of the Human Rights and Good Governance Programme Phase III (2009-2013) is DKK 4.7 million, which is 2.8% of the total programme budget (DKK 170 million). The figures for specific M&E activities are given below: 1. Total cost of the baseline study carried out by Inter Disciplinary Analysts, a local consultancy firm, in 2010: DKK 0.7 million 2. Total cost of the Joint Annual Reviews of different strategic partnership programmes by national consultants (2009-2013): DKK 0.9 million 3. Total field monitoring cost (2009-2013): DKK 0.2 million (This cost does not include the field monitoring cost of the Social Inclusion Adviser, who also functions as the M&E focal person within DanidaHUGOU, which is included in No. 5 below.) 4. Total cost of national and international consultants for the review of Human Rights and Good Governance Programme – III (2010): 0.5 million 5. Technical assistance on M&E, coordination of baseline study, preparation of DanidaHUGOU Result-Based M&E framework, monitoring meetings, and contributing to Joint Annual Reviews of different strategic partnership programmes consume 50% of the Social Inclusion Adviser's time. The cost of this time + total cost of the Social Inclusion Adviser's field travel: DKK 0.4 million 6. Terminal evaluations of 13 strategic partners (2013): DKK 0.5 million 7. Quality Assurance Mechanism (Local Governance and Community Development Programme): DKK 0.7 million 8. Quality Assurance and Review Adviser to the project, Strengthening the Capacity of National Human rights Commission of Nepal: DKK 0.7 million 9. HUGOU audit: DKK 0.1 million Kindly note that the figures (except the total programme budget) are rounded.

Analytic questions	Desk analysis	Interview
8. What is the cost in terms of man-hours or consultancy fees in maintaining the system?		
9. Assessment of ToR with M&E consultancies		No consultancies.
10. The system is documented		Partly through the M&E framework but no document on how M&E is done.
11. Focus on methodological learning		There are review and reflection sessions with the partners and advisors periodically. Some partners document these sessions via progress reports or minutes. This is based on observations from monitoring visits with a methodological focus from the advisors.
12. Is it still in use? Why not?		Yes.
13. Challenges	Review Report: "ECN and NHCR are furthermore monitored through the UNDP/ESP and the UNDP/SCNHRC projects. The NPTF and the UNPFN have established comprehensive monitoring systems that are closely followed. It appears that the monitoring of the support to Saferworld and Alert (and perhaps also SfCG, who, however, have provided extensive reporting) is lagging behind. This may be a result of the more fragmented monitoring structure of the PSP compared to the HRGGP. The RT recommends that EoD's monitoring of the PSP is strengthened."	A) Partners report on their own set of indicators (own M&E framework) and this does not necessarily correspond with the programme level M&E framework indicators → difficult to report on outcome on programme level. There will be a completion report on impact/outcome level indicators/targets on programme level. No data will be reported until then. The programme only has sporadic data on these levels from partners and programme field reports. There is room for improvement in the ongoing M&E. B) No database (see above). C) Donors define results and M&E terms differently and that is a challenge for the partners. The programme has discussed to use the five trad. logframe levels and agreed to use the terminology used in the existing programme M&E framework.

Annex 3: Example of M&E Consultancy Terms of Reference (Tanzania)

Support to strengthening
Planning, monitoring and reporting systems within
BSPS III

1. Background

Danida has provided project and programme support to business and private sector development in Tanzania since the early 1990'ies. The first phase of the Business Sector Programme Support, BSPS I, with a total budget of DKK 150 million was implemented from 1998 – 2003. The second phase, BSPS II, with a total budget of DKK 225 mio was implemented from 2003 – 2008. The third phase, BSPS III, with a total budget of DKK 500 mio has started in July 2008 and will be implemented through June 2013.

BSPS III comprises three major components:

- **Business Environment Strengthening** including business environment reform processes, advocacy and labour market reform processes.

- **Improved access to market** including international trade issues and capacity building in international trade and international business.

- **Development of micro, small and medium size enterprises** including matching grant facilities for SME development, and financial services to MSMEs.

A significant support to develop, strengthen and institutionalise the planning, monitoring and reporting systems was provided to three components of BSPS II: market access, labour market and viable banking and financing. A uniformed planning, monitoring and reporting system that adheres to the Danida Aid Management Guidelines was developed during 2004. Training of all organisations and projects was completed during 2005 and a manual capturing the processes to be followed and format for the various documents was also developed. The efforts to gradually align the BSPS II monitoring and reporting system with systems, specific to the selected institutions, were also attempted and the institutions have been using the system, though not at an optimum level.

BSPS III will build on the partners' monitoring and reporting systems in a view to strengthen the planning, monitoring and reporting systems of different institutions and project organizations (BSPS III sub-components) which will be receiving the Danish support in BSPS III. The beneficiaries will include ATE, TUCTA, MITM, FCM, SCF and PASS. Following the increased alignment of Danish support to BSPS III partners' systems and procedures, the strategy will be to build on the partners' existing monitoring and reporting systems rather than establishing specific procedures for BSPS III. To this effect, the partners will not be required to report to the Embassy but rather to their respective relevant authority (like governing boards etc) with a copy to the Embassy of Denmark.

In the BSPS III the sub-component partners will be responsible for monitoring the achievement of the sub-component outputs and their contribution to the sub-component objectives. The programme coordination unit of the Embassy of Denmark will be responsible for monitoring trends in indicators for the development objectives and the three immediate objectives.

2. Objective of the Consultancy

The objective of the consultancy is to strengthen the planning, monitoring and reporting function of the BSPS III by assisting the above mentioned BSPS III partners to appreciate the importance and need of having and using an effective and efficient M&E systems and thus generate strong partners' commitment to develop, strengthen and use their respective planning, monitoring and reporting systems.

3. Scope of Work

Specifically the Consultant will:

- Assess the partners' existing system and agree with the partners on any changes / need for strengthening.
- Support the partners in developing and implementing improved systems including providing refresher capacity building on the planning, monitoring and reporting system based on the institutional/project need.
- Assist the BSPS III partners' to raise the institutional awareness on the importance and need of having and using an effective and efficient planning, monitoring and reporting system.
- Assist the coordination unit at the Embassy of Denmark to collect the data and produce periodic (preferably annually) monitoring reports on the realisation of the three immediate and development objectives.

The consultant will provide advice and support to the agencies within the above mentioned areas. The consultants will liase closely with agency staff as well as advisers and other consultants attached to the programme.

4. Outputs

The outputs of the consultancy include the following:

1) Produce annual brief showing the progress in achieving the immediate objectives of BSPS III in 2008/2009.
2) BSPS III partners aware of the importance and need of having and using an effective and efficient planning, monitoring and reporting system.
3) Strengthened planning, monitoring and reporting systems and capacities in all organisations.
4) Support the partners in documenting their monitoring framework where a document does not already exist.
5) Any other support that may be required in the area of planning, monitoring and reporting.

5. Reporting

In addition to preparation of the annual brief above, the consultant will produce periodic briefs summarizing the work done with the various organisations and progress monitoring frameworks, where developed with input from the consultant will also be submitted to the RDE.

6. Timing

…

7. Input

…

List of Abbreviations

AECF	African Enterprise Challenge Fund
ATE	Association of Tanzania Employers
BEST-AC	Business Environment Advocacy Programme
BSPS	Business Sector Programme Support
BTI	Bertelsmann Stiftung's Transformation Index
CA	Constituent Assembly
DBP	Danida Business Partnerships
DGF	The Democratic Governance Facility
DKK	Danish Kroner
ECN	Election Commission of Nepal
EoD	Embassy of Denmark
ESP	The Electoral Support Project
FCM	Faculty of Commerce and Management
GoN	Government of Nepal
HRGGP	Human Rights and Good Governance Programme
HUGOU	Human Rights and Good Governance Advisor Unit
INSEC	Informal Sector Service Centre
KEPSA	Kenya Private Sector Alliance
LFM	Logical Framework Matric
LGCDP	Local governance and community development
M&E	Monitoring & Evaluation
MITM	Ministry of Industry, Trade and Marketing
MoV	Means of Verification
MSME	Micro, small and medium sized enterprises
NNDSWO	Nepal National Dalit Social Welfare Organisation
NPTF	Nepal Peace Trust Fund
OHCHR	Office of High Commissioner for Human Rights
PASS	Private Agricultural Sector Support
PMU	Programme Management Unit
PSC	Programme Steering Committee
PSP	Peace Support Programme
RDE	Royal Danish Embassy
REACT	Renewable Energy & Adaption Climate Technologies
SAMAGRA	Holistic Development Service Centre
SCF	SME Competitiveness Facility
SMART	Specific, measurable, attainable, relevant and time bound
SME	Small and medium sized enterprises
TMEA	Trademark East Africa
ToR	Terms of Reference
TUCTA	Trade Union Congress of Tanzania
TYIP	Three Year Interim Plan
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNMIN	United Nations Mission in Nepal
UNPFN	United Nations Peace Fund for Nepal