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This study is a synthesis of nine studies on the supply of, and demand for, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) and performance management (PM) services in Sub-Saharan Africa. The studies include the following:

- Country M&E case studies facilitated by the CLEAR Anglophone Africa Center at the University of Witwatersrand in 2012;
- Five studies analyzing the demand for M&E in various Sub-Saharan African countries, written by organizations in 2010 that were finalists in the selection of a CLEAR Center for Anglophone Sub-Saharan Africa; and
- Studies examining the supply of M&E and PM services serving Sub-Saharan Africa, commissioned by IEG in 2009.
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### Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLEAR Initiative</td>
<td>Regional Center’s on Learning for Evaluation and Results (CLEAR) Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Civil society organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPRS I</td>
<td>Ghana Poverty Reduction Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRPS II</td>
<td>Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy (Ghana)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MED</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation Directorate (Kenya)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDPC</td>
<td>National Development Planning Commission (Ghana)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Nongovernmental organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEAP</td>
<td>Poverty Eradication Action Plan (Uganda)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNAIDS</td>
<td>Joint United Nations Program on HIV/AIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>UN Children’s Fund</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overview
This report synthesizes information from nine studies conducted under the Regional Centers on Learning for Evaluation and Results (CLEAR) Initiative regarding the demand for and supply of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) and performance management (PM) services in Anglophone Sub-Saharan Africa between 2011 and 2013. The purpose of this synthesis is to serve as a basis for continuing to map the supply of and demand for M&E and PM in Anglophone Africa.

A conceptual framework based on earlier work done by the Independent Evaluation Group (IEG), World Bank, guides the country-level synthesis in this report. The framework identifies categories of evidence regarding demand for and supply of M&E and PM services (e.g., the existence of national development policies or evaluation systems) in a given country. For each country covered by the studies, information was organized within these categories. For some countries, there was an extensive amount of information that responded to almost all categories contained in the framework. For others, the studies provided very little information. The framework is included as an appendix to this document and a table summarizing the findings by country for each category of the framework can be found below.

The studies include three types of documents. The first is a set of exploratory country M&E case studies facilitated by the CLEAR Anglophone Africa Center at the University of Witwatersrand (CLEAR-Wits) in 2012. The second are five studies analyzing the demand for M&E in various Sub-Saharan African countries, written by organizations in 2010 that were finalists in the selection of a CLEAR Center for Anglophone Sub-Saharan Africa. The third are studies examining the supply of M&E and PM services serving Sub-Saharan Africa, commissioned by IEG in 2009.

The Anglophone Sub-Saharan African countries covered in the studies and synthesized in this paper include Botswana, Ghana, Kenya, Malawi, Namibia, Rwanda, South Africa, Swaziland, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia, and Zimbabwe. Some countries were covered by multiple studies, whereas others were only included in only one. The level of detail provided also varied per country. Ghana, Kenya, South Africa, Uganda and, to a slightly lesser degree, Tanzania were covered extensively; Swaziland and Zimbabwe were barely covered. Botswana, Malawi, Namibia, Rwanda, and Zambia fell in the middle. A summary is provided for each country.

Most of the entities providing M&E and PM capacity building were national and operated only within their own countries. These are included in the country summaries. Some capacity building organizations and initiatives offered their services regionally or globally. These services are included in a separate summary as an appendix to the document.

This synthesis closely paraphrases the findings presented in the above documents. Sources for the information are noted.

In many instances, where studies covered the same countries, they agreed on facts and provided similar assessments. Where there were discrepancies, this is noted.
Most of the documents included in this synthesis are from 2009 and 2010, with only the case studies written in 2012. As a result, the case studies were taken as a starting point for the countries that they covered. Information from the M&E demand and supply studies may no longer be up to date.

The information provided in this synthesis may also be incomplete. The synthesis is limited to the information that was provided in the studies and may not fully or accurately reflect the supply of and demand for M&E and PM services in the countries covered. Bringing the information up to date and ensuring its completeness and accuracy will be the task of future research.
Conceptual Framework & Overview of Findings of Supply and Demand for M&E and PM Information and Services in Sub-Saharan Africa by Country

Note: X’s mark the categories of the conceptual framework for which the studies contain information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conceptual Framework Categories</th>
<th>Countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elements Supporting Demand for M&amp;E and PM Information and Services</strong></td>
<td>Botswana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Development Policies/Plans and Poverty Reduction Strategies</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government M&amp;E Frameworks</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector Management Reforms</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Culture and Incentives</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Champions</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization of M&amp;E and PM Information</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles of Donors and Civil Society in Generating Demand</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government and CSO demand for skills building in M&amp;E and PM (training initiatives etc.)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outsourcing Evaluations</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conceptual Framework Categories</th>
<th>Countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supply of M&amp;E and PM Information and Services</strong></td>
<td>Botswana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government M&amp;E Entities and Systems (Agencies, roles, existing database, information systems etc.)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of M&amp;E and PM Information</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nongovernmental Entities Engaged in M&amp;E</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Capacity Building Services (Domestic Services and External Assistance for the provision of services)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of Country Findings

Elements Supporting Demand for M&E and PM Information and Services

**National Development Plans and Poverty Reduction Strategies.** Demand for M&E and PM information within the governments covered by this synthesis is, for the most part, based in national development plans and poverty reduction strategies. Unfortunately, in the cases of Botswana, Malawi, and Zimbabwe there was little information on the relationship between these and the demand for M&E and PM capacity building. In Ghana, Kenya, Rwanda, South Africa, and Uganda, their constitutions established the foundation for M&E and PM.

**Government M&E Frameworks.** In all countries, the governments have passed laws and adopted regulations and policies that increase the demand for M&E and PM information and that promote modern budgetary principles, such as results-based management.

Three countries (Kenya, South Africa, and Uganda) have developed national evaluation policies. In South Africa, the government has approved an evaluation policy, whereas in Kenya and Uganda evaluation policies are in draft form and awaiting approval. In South Africa, the evaluation policy establishes the typology, principles, and standards for evaluation. The government of South Africa’s evaluation policy and supporting efforts are aimed at increasing M&E capacity and promoting the use of evaluation results. In its early years, it focused on the evaluation of a limited number of strategic government priorities, which sector departments propose and the Cabinet approves.

In Kenya, the evaluation policy, once approved, will allow the government’s lead M&E agency to set minimum M&E standards and establish quality assurance mechanisms for major evaluations. In Uganda, an approved evaluation policy will provide the institutional framework for national M&E, as well as define and harmonize the roles, responsibilities, and relationships of public institutions involved in M&E. This latter function is critical in Uganda, given the number of institutions currently involved in M&E and the overlap in their current mandates.

**Organizational Culture and Incentives.** None of the governments covered in these studies is described as having established a government-wide culture that supports M&E and PM and the use of M&E and PM findings, although some are described as having made some progress. M&E is often viewed as a control and policing tool or extractive activities, because of how they have been used in the past. This has led to a lack of ownership and little interest in using their findings to inform decision-making. This seems to be most true at governments’ local levels, but also is reflected in line ministries.

**Evaluation Champions.** The government of Uganda benefits from having a strong and well-placed evaluation champion in the offices of the President and the Prime Minister. Their championing of M&E is reflected in the support that others also afford it and the new M&E initiatives that the Office of the Prime Minister has been able to undertake. The government of South Africa also has good support for M&E at the ministerial levels, thus helping its lead evaluation agency advance its agenda. The
government of Kenya is highlighted as particularly lacking a champion for its lead evaluation agency, thus, hampering its effectiveness. Similarly, in Ghana, as of 2010, the constitutionally mandated lead M&E agency had less influence with the President than other offices.

**Utilization of M&E and PM Information and Services.** In the countries covered by these studies, varying degrees of utilization of M&E and PM information are reported. Although the type of information being used is unclear, in most cases, it seems to be monitoring and PM information. Some countries report little to no information being used, although most lack evidence to support their claims. Information timeliness and quality affect its use, as does the policy maker’s capacity to interpret the information provided.

In Kenya, South Africa, and Uganda specific examples are provided of how government entities are using M&E and PM information to improve performance. For example, the case study of Kenya describes how the Ministry of Immigration and Registration of Persons uses M&E information to improve its performance and how the Ministry of Finance uses monitoring information to track and fix leakages in finances.

**Roles of Donors and Civil Society in Generating Demand.** In most of the countries, donors play a large role in generating demand for M&E services. In many cases, evaluation originally received attention because of donors’ accountability requirements, and in some cases, donor accountability demands continue to significantly influence government M&E investments. In some instances, this pressure is viewed as positive, as government M&E investments can result in increased M&E capacity. In other instances, concerns are raised that government officials prioritize meeting donor accountability requirements over responding to government-identified M&E needs. In some cases, in spite of donor investments, governments are reported to have made little progress building their M&E capacities and systems.

**Government and CSO demand for skills building in M&E and PM.** Some governments, such as the government of Uganda, have prioritized M&E and PM capacity building in their national development plans. In some countries, such as South Africa and Uganda, the governments’ lead M&E agencies have been directly involved in building this capacity and working to generate broad ownership of government M&E efforts. In these and other countries, the governments are also identifying training institutes that can meet government capacity building needs. Other governments recognize the need to invest in M&E and PM capacity building but have not articulated specific plans for doing so, and nor have they identified government entities to lead or champion the effort.

**Outsourcing Evaluations.** In all the countries profiled, the governments outsource evaluation because of insufficient internal evaluation capacity. For some countries, concerns are raised that by outsourcing evaluations and not ensuring a certain degree of government involvement, the governments are not building ownership of evaluation processes and findings and are missing opportunities to use evaluation findings to inform their decision making.
Supply of M&E and PM Information and Services

*Government M&E Entities and Systems.* Each of the governments included in these studies has at least one government entity charged with leading M&E efforts, although in Namibia and Swaziland these entities are solely sector focused. In most cases, the governments have multiple entities charged with leading government-wide M&E efforts, and in most of those cases, there is some overlap in roles and responsibilities, causing duplication of effort and inefficiency. In a few cases, such as Ghana and Kenya, as of 2010, this was exacerbated because entities other than those constitutionally mandated to lead M&E received greater support from the President to fulfill those roles. In Uganda, approval of the draft evaluation policy will help clarify roles, responsibilities, and relationships among entities engaged in M&E.

All the governments covered by the studies are described as having insufficient numbers of personnel dedicated to M&E and insufficient levels of M&E expertise among their M&E staff. Government entities, especially at the local level but also in some line ministries, lack the infrastructure necessary to establish and maintain M&E systems. In some cases, government entities lack databases and the capacity to manage them.

Budgets for monitoring, evaluation, and related capacity-building efforts are also described as insufficient. Where more specific information about budgets is available, it is often noted that only small portions of M&E budgets are spent on evaluation, with the vast majority dedicated to monitoring. Of the amounts dedicated to monitoring, the majority of that is spent on capacity building and field visits, rather than data collection, management, analysis, reporting, and dissemination.

The governments are at varying points of establishing government-wide M&E systems. Only in Namibia, Swaziland, and Rwanda is a government-wide M&E system not mentioned in the studies. In many of the other countries, the government has built a government-wide M&E system to assess its progress against poverty reduction strategies and national development plans. In South Africa, the system was mandated by the Cabinet, and in Uganda it was created by the Office of the Prime Minister.

Where government-wide M&E systems exist, the studies reveal challenges with their implementation. In most cases, the lead M&E agency has difficulty receiving quality and timely data and information from other parts and levels of government. In many cases, because of its own limited budget and resources, the lead M&E agency is dependent on others to provide data and relies on goodwill, rather than explicit authority, to encourage compliance. Other government entities lack sufficient numbers of skilled M&E personnel to gather required data, and weak management information systems make storing and sharing data difficult.

Most of the studies describe sector-level M&E systems, with the health sector M&E systems noted as being among the most developed. Project-level M&E systems are also more common, some of which are designed to respond to donor demands and some of which meet international non-governmental organizations’ requirements. Aligning all these M&E systems and integrating them into one national-level system has been a challenge in all the countries. As a result, many of these countries have multiple M&E systems.
**Availability of M&E and PM Information.** Some governments have evaluation plans, and some of the studies describe evaluations that the governments have undertaken. However, the vast majority of government efforts have focused on PM and monitoring. Government-led evaluation remains relatively new, with much fanfare around the evaluations being systematically undertaken in South Africa and Uganda.

All the governments included in the studies have a number of M&E tools and approaches that they use to regularly gather information on budget expenditure and government performance. This information is shared with the Parliament and Cabinet and informs budget allocations and policy decisions. Related to these reporting efforts are few systems that ensure data quality, because of limited budgets and limited numbers of skilled M&E personnel.

Most of the governments make M&E and PM information available within the government and for donors, civil society, and the general public. Many have websites where they can post reports, although in some cases, posted reports are out of date. Many publish reports in user-friendly formats. Most present reports within the government through official channels at regular intervals. Information is made available to donors, civil society organizations (CSOs), and the public upon request.

**Nongovernmental entities engaged in M&E.** Nongovernmental entities are engaged in M&E in all of these countries. Most have their own M&E systems and practices. Some participate officially in government working groups, policy making and/or M&E activities (Ghana, Kenya, Namibia, Swaziland, Uganda, and Zambia). They also serve a watchdog function, with CSOs and the media, in addition to Parliaments, increasingly demanding government performance information.

Evaluation associations are listed for all the countries included in the studies. However, their levels of activity vary, with many described as inactive. Some, however, are actively involved in building national M&E capacity.

**Evaluation Capacity Building Services.** In most of these countries, university departments and institutes offer M&E capacity-building services. In some countries, private institutes also provide M&E training. In a few, such as South Africa, the government has set up its own M&E training facility. In all of the countries, donors directly support governments’ efforts to develop and implement M&E systems and/or to build personnel M&E capacity. Sometimes donors and international nongovernmental organizations also build government M&E capacity indirectly through the programs and projects in which they are investing.
Botswana

Supply of M&E and PM Information and Services

Government M&E Entities and Systems
The Vision 2016 Council, which includes representatives from government, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), civil society and the private sector, is responsible for monitoring and evaluating Vision 2016’s progress. The Central Statistics Office also has a role in monitoring and assessing the progress and achievements of Vision 2016: it manages and operates the national M&E system, an online database created for this purpose (CREST Team 2010, pp. 24-25).

Other government entities engaged in M&E are sector focused. These include the Department of Health Policy, Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation, the Department of Health Sector Relations and Partnership, and the National AIDS Coordinating Agency. The health policy department leads health sector M&E. Together with the Department of Health Sector Relations and Partnership, it coordinates and monitors other stakeholders involved in health development. The AIDS agency is responsible for harmonizing the national response to HIV and AIDS, which includes a mandate to develop and manage a national HIV and AIDS M&E system (CREST Team 2010, pp. 26-27).

According to one study, personnel involved in M&E and PM are insufficient in number and overworked (CREST 2010, p. 37).

With technical assistance from the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), the Government of Botswana created an accessible national, on-line M&E system database to capture government reporting, as well as reporting from other stakeholders. It was linked to the national development planning process. However, as of 2010, the M&E system was not fully functioning and data were still being collected manually, making their collation challenging (CREST Team 2010, p. 37).

One study found the greatest advances in developing M&E frameworks in the health sector and particularly in programs related to HIV and AIDS. The Southern African Development Community Parliamentary Forum Regional Standing Committee on HIV and AIDS has encouraged these efforts, and the World Health Organization has invested significantly in building Botswana’s health sector’s evaluation capacity. Yet, in 2009, the World Health Organization reported problems with coordination among programs, challenges with data collection and analysis, including insufficient numbers of skilled staff and a lack of consistency in the health information reported by different partners, as well as limited data use (CREST Team 2010, p. 27).

There are a number of efforts to develop M&E tools, requests to departments to incorporate M&E, and commitments to prioritize M&E. However, as of 2010, another study did not find evidence of the results of these efforts. The 2004 Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) report provided a similar finding. In it, the United Nations Development Group observed that, in spite of external investment in Botswana’s M&E capacities, implementation remained limited. Capacities to collect, analyze, and disseminate data were weak, and it was difficult for users to access information (CREST Team 2010, pp. 25, 34-35, 37).
Evaluations Undertaken
According to one study Vision 2016 has been evaluated, but called "limited at best." As of 2010, the Vision 2016 website only listed two annual reports: 2003 and 2004, with only the 2003 report available online.

Nongovernmental Entities Engaged in M&E
The government of Botswana has recognized NGOs as important contributors to human development. It has prioritized sectors requiring development assistance and also M&E attention. Complementing this, the Botswana Council of NGOs, as reflected in the NGO Code of Conduct, agrees that NGOs must monitor and evaluate their performance. Botswana has a professional evaluation association--the Botswana Evaluation Association--but the studies did not provide further information about it (CREST Team 2010, p. 31).

Evaluation Capacity Building Services
Domestic Services
According to one of Botswana’s lead researchers and evaluators, as of 2010, the only institute offering M&E training in Botswana was the Institute of Development Management. It is a regional organization operating in Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland that offers very basic training. The U.S. President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief and the World Bank also offer occasional training (CREST Team 2010, p. 37).

External Assistance
Many donors have invested in Botswana’s evaluation capacities. As noted above, the United Nations Development Programme has invested in the national M&E system, and the World Health Organization has invested in the government’s M&E capacity within the health sector. The Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS), UN Family, Centers for Disease Control/Botswana-USA, African Comprehensive HIV and AIDS Partnership, Botswana Harvard AIDS Institute Partnership, and Botswana-Harvard President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief have also invested in M&E in Botswana’s health sector and especially in HIV and AIDS programming. Roll Back Malaria has invested in the government’s capacity to monitor and evaluate its malaria programs. The UN Population Fund has invested in Botswana’s M&E mechanism for its National Population Policy. There has been less donor investment in M&E and PM capacity outside the health sector (CREST Team 2010, pp. 29-30, 33-34).
Ghana

Elements Supporting Demand for M&E and PM Information and Services

National Development Policy and Poverty Reduction Strategies
In 1995, the government of Ghana instituted its national development policy Vision 2020, with the goal of transforming Ghana into a middle-income country by its final year. It achieved that goal in 2011. In recent years, the Ghana Poverty Reduction Strategy (GPRS I, 2003-2005), the Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy (GPRS II, 2006-2009), and the Ghana Shared Growth and Development Agenda (2010-13) have guided Vision 2020’s implementation. The last strategy promotes transparent and accountable governance and places greater emphasis on results-based management (CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 52, 54).

There have been some recurring challenges implementing the national development policy framework in some parts of government. These challenges result from problems that include a lack of M&E capacity and a lack of information about how the country’s M&E resources are deployed. The government of Ghana recognizes that undertaking an assessment of its M&E resources would help it know where to target its efforts to strengthen its M&E capacities (University of Witwatersrand, Graduate School of Public and Development Management 2010, p. 7).

The government first attempted to link its medium-term development planning framework and the annual national budget in 2002 through the Medium Term Expenditure Framework. The Ministry of Finance’s budget preparation guidelines are informed in part by M&E findings captured in annual progress reports (CLEAR-Wits 2012, p. 63).

Ministries, departments, and agencies are required to monitor and evaluate the performance of their programs and projects periodically. They track actual expenditure, outputs achieved, and revenue collected against targets, and they present solutions in areas where targets have not been met. They receive incentives or penalties, in response to their performance against targets. Performance above a minimum standard investment, as measured by the Functional Organisational Assessment Tool, may lead to increased grants the following year. However, although government investments are informed by and measured against national development framework objectives, indicators, and targets, many of the indicators are activity or output level, with only a few focused on outcomes (CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 62, 63-64).

Summary of Supply of Information and Services

Government M&E Entities and Systems
The National Development Planning Commission (NDPC), an independent government agency, was established in 1992 under the Constitution (§87 2 e) as the lead agency in monitoring, evaluating, and coordinating development policies. The NDPC’s responsibilities are further defined in the National Development Planning Commission Act (1994, Art. 479) and in the National Development Planning (Systems) Act (1994, Art. 480). The NDPC provides guidance to other parts of the government in the creation of their
M&E plans and advises the President and legislature on the performance of public policies and programs, noting where reforms might be required.

The NDPC’s 2011 budget was $3.6 million. However, the NDPC’s work is much broader than M&E, with only 14 percent of its budget spent on M&E activities in 2009. In 2011, the NDPC had a total of 47 staff members, with 20 technical staff members, yet of the 20, only five were in the M&E Division. Given its limited resources, to implement the M&E plan, the NDPC relies on the budget and activities of line ministries, departments, and agencies (CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 10-11, 52, 57).

The Policy Evaluation and Oversight Unit was established within the Office of the Presidency in 2009 with an explicit political alignment. Its mandate was to develop a results-based monitoring and evaluation system that responded to the National Democratic Congress party’s 2008 Electoral Manifesto. This entailed creating and managing the Evidence-Based PM System, a national database of policies, programs, and projects; monitoring and evaluating those policies, programs, and projects; and providing the Presidency and other government entities with performance feedback and advice related to advancing the national development policy. The system was aligned to the ruling party’s development agenda, which was not directly linked to a long-term national vision. The unit’s budget information was not available. As of 2012, it had 13 staff members, of which 9 were technical experts. In 2009, it spent approximately $1.55 million on M&E (CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 10-11, 57).

There has been some overlap in the responsibilities of the NDPC and the Policy Evaluation and Oversight Unit, especially around data collection and monitoring. The NDPC is constitutionally Ghana’s lead M&E agency. The evaluation unit, which is closer to the President, was created by and for a particular administration, thus, giving it more influence in the short term but an uncertain future. In addition, it has not had the technical staff necessary to effectively perform its functions. As a result, as of 2012, its evaluation function was not yet operational. Further, the rest of government, perceiving it to be a political instrument, provides a low response rate to its information requests (CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 55, 57, 59).

Increasing the challenge of operating Ghana’s M&E system is the number of other units playing key roles in its implementation. The NDPC and Policy Evaluation and Oversight Unit—the lead agencies—set standards and collate information, but rely on other entities at national and local levels to undertake primarily monitoring but also some evaluation efforts. The Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning and the Ghana Statistical Service share, with the NDPC, responsibility for the technical components of the national M&E system. The Evidence-based Policy Making Technical Committee, made up of representatives of the NDPC, Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning, Office of the President and Ghana Statistical Service, among other agencies, provides oversight to the national M&E system and capacity building and addresses systemic constraints, as well as linking the NDPC with the Presidency and the Parliament (CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 52, 56-57).

Parliament tracks government policy and program performance, by reviewing the annual national budget and receiving feedback from civil society organizations (CSOs) on the performance of government programs and policies. Members of Parliament disseminate results of government policies to their constituents. In 2009, they spent approximately $1.2 million on M&E activities, with the expenditure predominantly covering field visits and the committee training program (CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 57, 59).
The Cross Sectoral Planning Groups, comprised of representatives from ministries, departments and agencies, the private sector, development partners, NGOs and CSOs, assesses the performance of national-level government interventions and works to build M&E commitment among senior level government officials. Regional and district monitoring groups report on M&E issues related to the national M&E system at their levels (CLEAR-Wits 2012, p. 60).

In ministries, there are policy planning and M&E departments that assess the performance of government interventions. However, many of these units lack adequate capacity to perform their roles effectively and have minimal evaluation functions (CLEAR-Wits 2012, p. 61).

The GPRS I M&E plan was the government’s first systematic attempt to include M&E in its governance framework. Under GPRS II, the government created the Ghana National M&E System and a GPRS II M&E Plan. As of early 2012, there was no new national M&E plan aligned to the Ghana Shared Growth and Development Agenda (CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 52, 55).

For the M&E system, the NDPC, which oversees it, collates reports from different parts and levels of government into one annual progress report. This process depends on varying M&E investments and capacities, as well as coordination, which is not always adequate. The NDPC provides M&E guidelines, clarifying reporting requirements. However, many institutions design their M&E systems to also respond to donor reporting requirements, thus, creating multiple M&E systems in one agency. In addition, the NDPC is not always able to assure data quality. As a result, the NDPC and the Ghana Statistical Service observe that the data they receive is often lacking in quality and timeliness. To improve the implementation of its M&E and PM systems, the NDPC pointed to the need for greater investment at all levels, technical training in management information systems, and training of data collectors to ensure data quality (CLEAR-Wits 2012, p. 60; University of Witwatersrand, Graduate School of Public and Development Management 2010, p. 12).

**Evaluations Undertaken**

Evaluations are undertaken for specific projects, often donor-driven and executed by external consultants. This is reflected in the expenditure data: in 2010, of a total M&E budget of approximately $11.1 million, less than three percent was spent on evaluation. In contrast, 70 percent was spent on monitoring, the majority of which was spent on site visits and capacity building (CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 61, 65).

**Tools and Methods**

The annual progress report, which the NDPC presents to Cabinet and Parliament, is used to inform sector policy, program design, and budget allocations. Nonetheless, the government still lacks a comprehensive national economic model for planning and budgeting. Some officials go so far as to identify the report more as a donor accountability tool, with limited influence on government decision making (CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 52, 65; University of Witwatersrand, Graduate School of Public and Development Management 2010, pp. 5-6).

The Medium-Term Expenditure Framework was designed to align the budget and the national development plan. However, it has faced challenges with implementation and enforcement, which has led to a misalignment of resources. Concern is further expressed about the dominant role of the Ministry of Finance in this process (FEMA (MUK) & CPMER 2010, p. 21; CLEAR-Wits 2012, p. 65).
**Availability of M&E and PM Information**

The Evidence-Based PM System website is user-friendly and accessible to government stakeholders. Some analyzed data and reports are also available to the wider public. There is also an open opinion poll on the website that the Policy Evaluation and Oversight Unit and other government entities can use to learn how the Ghanaian electorate rates them (CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 58-59).

**Nongovernmental Entities Engaged in M&E**

NGOs and CSOs introduce citizens’ voices into the M&E process. Their roles, as stated in the national M&E framework, are to support preparation of the annual progress report through participation in the cross-sectorial planning groups, undertake social audits, and assist with dissemination of the national Annual Progress Reports to stakeholders (CLEAR-Wits 2012, p. 60).

Officials report good M&E capacity outside of government, with independent organizations, such as the Ghana Institute of Management and Public Administration and the Institute of Statistical Social and Economic Research, participating in the development of the annual report and the Citizens’ Report Card exercise and undertaking surveys and evaluations. The Ghana Evaluation Forum reports an emerging body of M&E practitioners, and the African Evaluation Association is based in Ghana (University of Witwatersrand, Graduate School of Public and Development Management 2010, p. 9).

**Evaluation Capacity-Building Services**

The Ghana Institute of Management and Public Administration, which was originally a joint government of Ghana and United Nations Special Fund Project created in 1961, is now a self-financing center for leadership training, business management, public administration and information and communications technology. M&E is offered as a short competency-building program and in short courses with a certificate of participation, as part of a bachelor of arts in project management, and through tailored courses. As of 2009, the Ghana Institute of Management and Public Administration planned to turn the M&E program into a diploma course and the project management course into a professional course. The Administration offers five courses per year, has a total of 65 staff members, including technical staff, and serves 4,000 students annually. It offers an annual regularized program and benefits from strong institutional backing and infrastructure, a permanent faculty, and consistent training options. The public sector is its primary client (Mukasa and Kisekka-Ntale 2009, pp. 17-18).

The Institute of Statistical, Social and Economic Research, an academic institute and think tank based at the University of Ghana, was created in 1962. It offers M&E training as part of its core postgraduate courses, as short courses, and through training and technical assistance. As of 2009, it offered four courses per year, had 10 technical experts on its staff, and could serve 150-200 students annually. It offers M&E capacity building as part of an annual regularized program, within long-term programs and based on client demand. It has strong institutional backing and infrastructure, a permanent faculty, and training courses that are consistently offered. The public sector is its primary client (Mukasa and Kisekka-Ntale 2009, pp. 20-21).
Kenya

Elements Supporting Demand for M&E and PM Information and Services

National Development Policy and Poverty Reduction Strategy
In recent years, Kenya’s national development has been guided by Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers. The Economic Recovery Strategy for Wealth and Employment Creation aligned the strategy papers with the then government’s economic manifesto (2002-08). In 2008, Vision 2030 was initiated and is being implemented in five-year, medium-term plans (CLEAR-Wits 2012, p. 74).

The economic recovery strategy mandated that the government use M&E to track its policies, programs, and projects. Under it, the government created the National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation System and the Monitoring and Evaluation Directorate (MED) to lead and coordinate the system. Under Vision 2030, the national system and MED were adjusted to track its progress and achievements (CLEAR-Wits 2012, p. 74).

National Evaluation Policy
The government of Kenya has a draft national evaluation policy awaiting Cabinet approval. Once the policy is approved, the MED will set minimum M&E standards and establish quality assurance mechanisms for major evaluations (CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 76, 81).

Laws, Regulations, and Policies Increasing the Demand for M&E and PM Information
The Local Government Act, Public Service Commission Act, Public Procurement and Disposal Act, and the Constitution of 2010 create demand for M&E, with the last explicitly requiring accountability and transparency from public institutions. By creating 47 counties in charge of their own development financing, the government has increased the need for M&E and PM services at the county level. In addition, some sector-focused policies demand performance M&E (CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 87-88; Kenya School of Monetary Studies 2010, p. 24; ESAMI, p. 5).

Laws and Regulations Focused on Modern Budgetary Principles
The Results for Kenya Programme (2006-08), part of Kenya's public service reform effort, introduced a results-based management culture and performance contracting in the Cabinet Office. However, the extent of its influence in other parts of government remained unclear, because of some questions about the reform agenda’s coherence, as well as political instability in the country. The Monitoring and Evaluation Directorate’s work was not linked to key reform programs, such as performance contracting. The latter operates independently of M&E work executed by MED and reports directly to the Office of the Prime Minister (CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 80, 84).

finances. Existing systems to improve financial management and reporting, such as the Integrated Financial Management Information System, were streamlined and reinforced (CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 75, 86).

Program-based budgeting, led by Business Development Services in the Ministry of Finance, demands M&E of public sector programs and projects, as well as the development of sector targets and indicators. The Anti-Corruption and Economic Crimes Act (2003), implemented by the Ministry of Justice, Cohesion and Constitutional Affairs, calls for monitoring public sector service delivery achievement. A number of other budget, financial and audit laws and regulations further enhance the government’s results focus (Kenya School of Monetary Studies 2010, pp. 13, 16-17).

Organizational Culture and Incentives
In spite of its many M&E efforts, Kenya is reported to have a weak M&E culture, with M&E considered as a policing tool, rather than seen as a tool to improve delivery, efficiency and effectiveness. The Monitoring and Evaluation Directorate does not have a strong national champion to support its efforts. Although high-level government officials have spoken publicly about the need to demonstrate results, these statements have only led to a focus on spending (CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 80, 91; ESAMI, p. 6).

Utilization of M&E and PM Information
The studies present differing views on the use of M&E findings in government decision-making. Some present evidence of positive uptake. Parliamentary committees use M&E information to inform budget formulation. The National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation System information provided by MED promotes evidenced-based decision making related to policy and program planning and implementation and serves as a communications tool with external stakeholders. The example of improvements in the performance of the Ministry of Immigration and Registration of Persons is provided (Kenya School of Monetary Studies 2010, p. 49; CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 76, 81).

Further, they report that the budget process and expenditure management is informed by the Annual Public Expenditure Review and the Annual Progress Reports produced by MED. The Public Expenditure Tracking Surveys in the health sector coordinated by MED have enabled the Ministry of Finance to identify leakages in finances at different levels. MED’s resource flow analysis helps the Ministry of Finance track resource requirements submitted by the line ministries through the sector working groups against the provided allocations by the Treasury. Accounting and auditing bodies, on the other hand, are reported to only use M&E information in a limited fashion for the purpose of understanding government financial allocation and performance (CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 75, 80; Kenya School of Monetary Studies 2010, p. 50).

Others observe weak links between M&E and performance information and government decision-making. This could be blamed on the way the information is communicated, the lack of explanation of how report information can inform ongoing and future investments, and the lack of avenues for sharing results (University of Witwatersrand, Graduate School of Public and Development Management 2010, p. 4; ESAMI 2010, p. 9).
**Roles of Donors and Civil Society in Generating Demand**

Pressure to improve M&E capacities, transparency and accountability comes from donors, Kenya’s citizens, the media and Parliament. There is increasing demand from citizens to see results from their tax payments. The media, which plays a watchdog role, provides extensive information about public institutions’ performance, as well as live coverage of Parliament’s proceedings. These efforts are complemented by the Parliament, which offers a check on the Executive (ESAMI 2010, p. 8).

**Outsourcing Evaluations**

The government outsources evaluations and PM work to entities such as African Capacity Development, Centre for African Growth, Institute of Policy and Analysis, and the Kenya Institute of Public Policy Research and Analysis, as well as to private sector consulting firms and individuals. The PETS pilot survey was conducted by the Institute for Policy Analysis and Research; the Jameel Poverty Action Lab has carried out numerous randomized control trials. Many other evaluations are undertaken in Kenya with donor support, relying on national institutions, such as the Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa, when capacities allow. However, the Monitoring and Evaluation Directorate has not been influential in the oversight, design or use of these evaluations (Kenya School of Monetary Studies 2010, p. 26; CLEAR-Wits 2012, p. 81).

**Supply of M&E and PM Information and Services**

**Government M&E Entities and Systems**

The government of Kenya has a number of entities involved in M&E and PM. MED, in the Ministry of Planning and National Development, which was established in 2008, leads and coordinates the National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation System at a national level. It sets M&E standards, establishes monitoring indicators, develops research agenda, provides M&E capacity building, and prepares all monitoring products, including the annual progress reports on Kenya Vision 2030’s national Medium Term Plan and the Annual Public Expenditure Review. It is assigned a number of other functions related to its relationship with the Cabinet and civil society (CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 10-11).

Yet, due to budget constraints, only some of its responsibilities—preparing APRs and PERs and some capacity building - are funded. The rest are often unfunded and are instead undertaken by a variety of other agencies. MED’s actual budget for 2011 ($1.3 million) was a fraction of its planned budget ($3.8 million), as a result of the political crisis of 2007-08 and the ensuing economic setback. After covering other costs, MED had approximately $400,000 left to dedicate to M&E efforts (CLEAR-Wits 2012, p. 79).

Also because of budget constraints, MED only had sixteen economists, some with minimal M&E training, and three communications officers who were charged with fulfilling the responsibilities of the agency’s five divisions, which serve 280 districts and 44 line ministries. The MED has no explicit evaluation function, except for what falls under research, highlighting the lack of national vision for evaluation (CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 77-79; Kenya School of Monetary Studies 2010, pp. 23-4).

Finally, MED has no legal basis and operates on goodwill. Its parent ministry, the Ministry of Planning, National Development and Vision 2030, lacks positional influence to champion the Directorate and M&E
work in general. Ministries, departments, and agencies, which often consider M&E a punitive exercise or investigation tool, may or may not be responsive to MED’s requests (CLEAR-Wits 2012, p. 80; CREST Team 2010, p. 44).

The Central Project Planning and Monitoring Units produce Ministerial Annual Monitoring and Evaluation Reports and Ministerial Public Expenditure Reviews, which are synthesized into the annual report and Public Expenditure Review, respectively. Central Project Planning and Monitoring Units are posted in ministries by the Ministry of Planning, National Development and Vision 2030 to monitor and feed MED in preparing PERs and APRs, but their host ministries, have decision-making powers over them, making it more difficult for MED to fulfill its M&E responsibilities. District Development Officers, supervised by the Provincial Directors of Planning, produce District Annual Monitoring and Evaluation Reports, which similarly feed into the APR (CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 75, 80).

The Vision 2030 Board and the Vision Delivery Secretariat, a semi-autonomous government agency that also sits in the Ministry of Planning, share monitoring and evaluation responsibility with MED. The Secretariat is responsible for monitoring flagship programs and projects in Kenya Vision 2030; there is no evidence of evaluations being undertaken as part of the Vision's implementation. Unlike MED, the Secretariat has prominent support from Kenya’s President and the Prime Minister. Its Board is comprised of permanent secretaries of the leading ministries and other strategic national institutions, as well as private sector leaders. It is well-staffed and resourced (CLEAR-Wits 2012, p. 84).

The Performance Contracting Department in the Office of the Prime Minister, like the Vision Delivery Secretariat and unlike MED, receives strong support from the President and Prime Minister. Yet, discrepancies between the results it has claimed and realities prompted the Prime Minister to appoint a panel of experts to investigate how it might be improved. The panel recommended that performance contracting be linked to other PM instruments and budgeting processes; that institutional performances be linked to national priorities; and that the judiciary and legislative branch also be made part of performance contracting (CLEAR-Wits 2012, p. 85).

Other entities involved in M&E and performance monitoring include the Ministry of Finance and National Treasury, the Auditor-General, and the Kenya National Bureau of Statistics. Others include ministries with sector-focused M&E efforts, such as health, agriculture, and livestock (CLEAR-Wits 2012, p. 86; Kenya School of Monetary Studies 2010, pp. 39-40).

The studies note that people in M&E and PM positions in the government, NGOs and private sector are insufficient in number and lack adequate skills. M&E budgets are exceedingly limited. Institutions are constrained by a lack of equipment and absence of a results-oriented culture. They view M&E as a back-end activity, rather than as a central part of the programming cycle (CREST Team 2010, p. 55; ESAMI 2010, p. 9).

Kenya’s National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation System was created by the Economic Recovery Strategy for Wealth and Employment Creation in 2003-04 and revised under Kenya Vision 2030 in 2008. It was designed to operate at three levels: the national-level MED; the Central Project Planning and Monitoring Units based in each line Ministry; and the District Planning Units based in every district. It
was mandated to produce annual progress and project monitoring reports at both national and district levels, as well as reports on public expenditure and policy research papers (CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 74, 79, 87).

However, because a number of other programs and organizations are involved in M&E, the National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation System—which intended to be the national M&E system—has become one component of a larger system that lacks adequate coordination. The government has also developed M&E capacities and systems within priority sectors, such as health and education. These parallel systems have not yet been explored for possible synergies, and in some cases, create multiple reporting mechanisms. Some NGOs also have institution-specific M&E systems that are separate from each other and from the national M&E system. These similarly could be explored for synergies (CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 75, 78, 80, 83; CREST Team 2010, pp. 45-52; ESAMI 2010, p. 9).

**Evaluations Undertaken**
Kenya’s M&E system is more focused on monitoring than evaluation. Project-level evaluations are common, as are evaluations carried out by NGOs and donors. The Monitoring and Evaluation Directorate carries out mid-term and final evaluations of its development programs, and some surveys, such as tracking surveys, could feed into evaluations.

**Tools and Methods**
Annual progress reports on Kenya Vision 2030’s national Medium Term Plan track the plan’s implementation progress against 48 national indicators, their targets and outcomes. The Annual Public Expenditure Review covers macro-economic performance, spending trends and implications for Kenya’s socioeconomic and governance sectors. The government has also used the Annual Public Expenditure Review to benchmark Kenya’s economic management against selected peer middle-income countries. The government is in the process of synchronizing these reviews with the budgetary cycle to increase its influence on policy decisions. However, because the MED relies on goodwill to receive M&E information from other parts of government, and because of human resource and budgetary constraints, the MED is often unable to produce annual reports and Annual Public Expenditure Reviews on time, limiting their utility to policy makers (CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 75, 79, 82).

Public Expenditure Tracking Surveys are coordinated by the Monitoring and Evaluation Directorate and used to identify leakages in finances. In October 2011, the government, with support and involvement from the World Bank, completed a tracking survey pilot study in the education sector and planned a survey that would cover the entire education sector in 2012, to be followed by one related to health and agriculture, after which other sectors would be incorporated. It is expected that these Public Expenditure Tracking Surveys will become the norm in all sectors, forming the basis for a new nationally owned monitoring and evaluation system (CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 80-81).

**Systems in Place to Ensure Data Quality**
The Monitoring and Evaluation Directorate has limited ability to check the quality of reported information. However, as a result of its demands and the standard reporting template it has produced,
ministries, departments, and agencies have demonstrated some improvement in reporting both in terms of timeliness and quality of the information provided (CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 77, 83).

**Availability of M&E and PM Information**

The Monitoring and Evaluation Directorate’s publications, such as annual progress reports, Public Expenditure Reviews, and others, are available on the Ministry’s website and elsewhere, such as District Information and Documentation Centers. MED has also produced popular versions of some publications in both English and Kiswahili. There are a number of other performance and M&E reports that are also made available within the government and to the public (CLEAR-Wits 2012, p. 78; Kenya School of Monetary Studies 2010, pp. 47-48).

The Monitoring and Evaluation Directorate uploads information regarding social sector indicators onto the KENINFO database and populates the indicators database with metadata on a quarterly basis. This online database, hosted by Kenya National Bureau of Statistics, is accessible to the public. The electronic project monitoring information system e-ProMIS, produced by the Ministry of Finance along with MED, helps the government track activity implementation based on funding allocations, which informs future year funding levels. The e-ProMIS will soon contain more indicators, as well as a dashboard showing project progress. In addition, the National AIDS Control Council, which coordinates all national HIV and AIDS efforts, as well as M&E related to them, has developed a national M&E database that facilitates the production of reports, by allowing for data searches and also assisting analysis (CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 80, 86; CREST Team 2010, p. 47).

**Nongovernmental Entities Engaged in M&E**

National and international CSOs undertake M&E related to their own programs. NGOs are involved in the government’s M&E efforts at various levels. At the local level, the Constituency Development Fund Act and the Local Government Authority Act require that CSOs be involved in the project identification and monitoring processes, although the nature of their involvement is unspecified. Mars Group and the Institute of Economic Affairs both monitor the budget, with the Institute presenting an annual citizens’ budget. Several NGOs are involved in advocacy. To the degree that their capacities allow, they use M&E and performance information to influence policy (ESAMI 2010, pp. 4, 8).

Private sector organizations have primarily been involved in M&E through their umbrella associations, such as the Kenya Association of Manufacturers, the Kenya Private Sector Alliance, and professional bodies such as the Law Society of Kenya and the Institute of Public Accountants of Kenya. These associations have influenced some reforms in their respective sectors (ESAMI 2010, p. 5).

The Kenya Institute of Public Policy Research and Analysis, an autonomous public policy research institute established by an act of Parliament; the Institute of Policy Analysis and Research, a think tank and independent nonprofit body mandated to conduct evidence-based social science policy analysis, research and training; and the Center for Economic and Social Right - Kenya, which carries out research and advocacy projects on economic, social, and cultural rights globally are involved in M&E and performance audit (Kenya School of Monetary Studies 2010, p. 27).
The studies provided conflicting information about the Kenya Evaluation Association. Two noted its collaboration with the National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation System to develop national M&E systems and discussed an M&E training program and research center it was exploring developing in partnership with others. (CREST Team 2010, 45, 52; Report on Efforts, 20). Another study reported that MED planned to revitalize what had been a relatively inactive association (ESAMI 2010, pp. 6-7).

Other nongovernmental organizations engaged in M&E are the Professionals in Measurements Network and the Evaluation Society of Kenya, but it did not provide further information about either. In the case studies, it is reported that MED has collaborated with groups such as the Evaluation Society of Kenya to foster a culture of M&E and strengthen its institutional capacity (Kenya School of Monetary Studies 2010, pp. 30-31; CLEAR-Wits 2012, p. 78).

**Evaluation Capacity Building Services**

*Domestic Services*

Government initiatives to build M&E and PM capacity include a policy paper on the institutionalization of M&E, “Guidelines for Implementation of National Monitoring and Evaluation System.” As of 2010, MED was developing an M&E training curriculum with support from the UN Populations Fund. In a later report, it was noted that MED has coordinated and supported the development of M&E curricula in various institutions. Many universities now have M&E modules or courses at master’s, post graduate diploma, and certificate levels (Kenya School of Monetary Studies 2010, p. 45; ESAMI 2010, p. 6; CLEAR-Wits 2012, p. 78).

The University of Nairobi offers a short-term M&E course with a certificate of attendance, as well as a Masters of Arts in Project Planning and Management. Maseno University similarly, offers a master’s of arts in Project Planning and Management. The Kenya Institute of Administration offers a short-term M&E course with a certificate of attendance. In 2010, The Kenya Institute for Project Management twice offered a seminar on M&E (Kenya School of Monetary Studies 2010, pp. 31-32; CREST Team 2010, p. 53).

*External Assistance*

International partners also invest in Kenya’s M&E and PM capacity development. The Danish International Development Agency has provided support for the development of a national health M&E system, creation of performance indicators, as well as for M&E activities. The World Bank’s Global HIV/AIDS Program hosts the Global HIV/AIDS Monitoring and Evaluation Team. This team of M&E specialists, based in Kenya, has developed M&E frameworks in consultation with stakeholders. The World Health Organization plays a key role in helping the national health sector reach its targets. The US Agency for International Development, through its programs, has strengthened Kenya’s M&E capacities and reinforced its M&E systems. The African Medical and Research Foundation offers a short-term M&E course, providing a certificate of attendance. Some NGOs have also offered program-relevant M&E capacity building through their programs (CREST Team 2010, pp. 45-46, 48-49, 52-53; Kenya School of Monetary Studies 2010, pp. 26, 31).

However, according to one study, officials believe that M&E and PM training needs cannot be met locally or regionally. As a result, most public sector employees requiring such training look further
abroad to places such as the International Program for Development Evaluation Training at Carleton University in Canada (Kenya School of Monetary Studies 2010, pp. 23-24).
Malawi

Elements Supporting Demand for M&E and PM Information and Services

Government M&E Frameworks

Laws, Regulations and Policies Increasing the Demand for M&E and PM Information
A Performance Management System for the Civil Service (2008) monitors performance of individual employees in Malawi. This is supported by strategic plans with M&E guidelines and templates. The country also has a Public Service Act and a National Statistics Act (ESAMI 2010, p. 11).

Laws and Regulations Focused on Modern Budgetary Principles.
Malawi’s budget laws and regulations, including the Public Financial Management Act (2003), Budget Law (draft form), Public Audit Act, and Public Procurement Act, focus on modern budget principles aimed at creating a results-oriented public sector. The government has also introduced PM systems and a requirement that all ministries and government agencies develop strategic plans (ESAMI 2010, pp. 11, 13).

Public Sector Management Reforms
As of 2010, the government planned to further advance public sector reforms through basket funding for sectors using the sector-wide approach, output-based budgeting, and the implementation of M&E and PM-related provisions of the Paris Declaration and Accra Agenda (ESAMI 2010, pp. 11, 13).

Utilization of M&E and PM Information
One study reports broad use of M&E information in policy decision-making. Parliament receives budget reports twice a year and uses them to inform debates, policy development and expenditure oversight. They are of particular interest to the Public Accounts Committee. Because Parliament lacks the capacity to evaluate the utility of performance information, it relies on the assistance of consultants in this regard (ESAMI 2010, pp. 15-16).

The Prime Minister’s Office or the Presidency receives institutional and employee’s performance information and M&E reports annually. Program managers in line ministries use M&E information for decision-making, evidence-based policy making, and improvement of program implementation. Accounting and auditing bodies use M&E and PM information to institute audits and inform public audit reports, as well as to finalize their accounts. Donors receive the Public Expenditure Tracking Surveys, annual reports, budgets and Common Approach to Budget Support reviews, as requested (ESAMI 2010, pp. 15-16).

Roles of Donors and Civil Society in Generating Demand
One study reports that a strong opposition party in Parliament, a vibrant civil society, and an increasingly alert media all contribute to demanding greater accountability of the use of public resources (ESAMI 2010, p. 11).
Government and CSO Demand for Skills Building in M&E and PM

As of 2010, the government planned to strengthen M&E capacity through M&E training, by training officials in PM systems and recruiting M&E experts. It also planned to form M&E professional associations. More than 80 people were scheduled to be trained over the course of three years (ESAMI 2010, pp. 13, 15).

Outsourcing Evaluations

The government engages external professionals and institutions for evaluations of public programs. Categories of institutions engaged in M&E activities include academic institutions, such as the University of Malawi, the Malawi Institute of Management and the Centre for Social Research; think tanks, such as the Economists Association of Malawi, the Malawi Economics Justice Network; and CSOs, such as Civil Society for Quality Basic Education and Malawi Health Equity Network (ESAMI 2010, p. 13).

Supply of M&E and PM Information and Services

Government M&E Entities and Systems

The Ministry of Development Planning and Cooperation coordinates M&E for the government. Sector ministries, such as agriculture, education, water and health, have M&E units. In ministries that have no planning units, policy units coordinate these activities (ESAMI 2010, pp. 11, 13).

According to one study, “the government of Malawi lacks adequate structures, institutions, equipment, financial resources and human capacity to support M&E.” This situation is worse at the district level. Compounding the problem are weak linkages among data sources. In 2010, $3 million was allocated for the M&E activities of all ministries and city councils. Half of this amount was invested in capacity building (ESAMI 2010, pp. 12-13).

As of 2010, a national M&E framework had been developed, but had not yet been rolled out to all government departments. Malawi has a National M&E Master Plan overseen by the Ministry of Development Planning and Cooperation (ESAMI 2010, pp. 11, 13).

Tools and Methods

The government of Malawi uses a number of M&E and PM tools already. These include the Framework for Monitoring the Development and Growth Strategy, the Common Approach to Budget Support Review, the Strategic Planning M&E Template, the PM system Annual Appraisal, a logical framework, Public Expenditure Tracking Surveys, Service Delivery Satisfaction Surveys, an Open Budget Index, and a participatory budgeting approach. One study lists these, but provides no further description of them (ESAMI 2010, pp. 11, 14).

Availability of M&E and PM Information

The Executive receives institutional and individual performance information and M&E reports annually. The legislature receives budget reports twice a year. Civil society and the public receive expenditure reports, as requested. Development partners receive all of these reports and especially the Public Expenditure Tracking Surveys, annual reports, budgets and Common Approach to Budget Support Reviews, as requested (ESAMI 2010, p. 15).
**Nongovernmental Entities Engaged in M&E**

According to one study, NGOs’ M&E capacities in Malawi are weak. CSOs have plans for building their M&E capacities, and the national M&E plan includes CSO capacity building (ESAMI 2010, pp. 14-15).

The Malawi Evaluation Association was established in the mid-2000s, but has remained largely inactive. Another study also mentions the Malawi Network of Evaluators (ESAMI 2010, p. 11; Kenya School of Monetary Studies 2010, p. 30).

**Evaluation Capacity Building Services**

*Domestic Services*

A number of academic institutions deliver M&E courses. ESAMI provides short courses in M&E, master’s degrees with M&E components and certificate courses. The Malawi Institute of Management provides certificates of attendance and a diploma in project management. The Staff Development Institute offers a certificate. About 100 people apply annually for M&E and project management training, but there are only 30-40 spaces available (ESAMI 2010, p. 13).

*External Assistance*

Development partners support the government of Malawi’s efforts to strengthen its statistical and M&E capacities. The MEASURE project of the U.S. Agency for International Development, for example, provided technical assistance to the National AIDS Commission to strengthen its data quality, data management and reporting system (ESAMI 2010, p. 15).
Namibia

Elements Supporting Demand for M&E and PM Information and Services

National Development Policies/Plans and Poverty Reduction Strategies
The government of Namibia developed its five-year National Development Plan (2007/2008 to 2011/2012) using a results-based management approach (CREST Team 2010, p. 70). There was no further information about the government’s demand for M&E and PM services in the studies.

Supply of M&E and PM Information and Services

Government M&E Entities and Systems
The National M&E Committee is made up of representatives from government departments, non-governmental organizations, the private sector, donor agencies, United Nations agencies, academic institutions, and coordinating bodies. The committee coordinates HIV/AIDS M&E activities in the country and develops national M&E strategies (CREST Team 2010, pp. 62-63).

The Ministry of Health and Social Services coordinates the M&E activities of health facilities participating in HIV/AIDS programs and provides information on disease surveillance. The Response Monitoring and Evaluation Subdivision within the Expanded National HIV/AIDS Coordination Division of the MoHSS leads data collection, management and analysis related to national HIV, tuberculosis, and malaria records. It also coordinates all HIV/AIDS intervention M&E efforts, facilitates the development of M&E strategies, and facilitates stakeholder capacity building (CREST Team 2010, pp. 61, 63).

The Ministry of Regional and Local Government, Housing and Rural Development has regional and constituency coordinating structures for HIV/AIDS, with offices responsible for monitoring and evaluating activities in each region and constituency (CREST Team 2010, p. 63).

The Directorate of HIV and AIDS Management Unit in the Ministry of Education is responsible for managing the HIV/AIDS response relating to the education sector. Regional AIDS Committees for Education were established, along with an M&E system that defines the roles, functions, and responsibilities of the M&E personnel and describes the HIV activities that are implemented and coordinated by the Global Fund (CREST Team 2010, p. 66).

In the Ministry of Education, the Directorate of Education Programme Implementation within the Directorate of Programmes and Quality Assurance also seeks to provide equal access to quality education for all Namibians. The EPI monitors and evaluates progress toward this goal (CREST Team 2010, p. 66).

As of 2010, the National Planning Commission had not yet set up a national M&E system to track the National Development Plan’s progress. However, the government has sectorial M&E systems in different ministries (CREST Team 2010, p. 70).
Because the government of Namibia is focused on addressing the HIV and AIDS crisis, it has invested its M&E efforts there. The government’s HIV and AIDS programming, including its related M&E efforts, are guided by the National Development Plan, the Medium-Term Plan on HIV/AIDS, the National Code on HIV/AIDS and the National Guidelines for Anti-retroviral Therapy. The Ministry of Health and Social Services released a plan for a National Multi-Sectorial M&E of HIV/AIDS for 2006/2007-2008/2009, with the purpose of guiding the country’s response to HIV/AIDS and measuring the effectiveness of the national response. This National Multi-Sectorial Plan is supported by the Namibian Monitoring and Evaluation Information System (CREST Team 2010, pp. 60-61).

Challenges faced by the M&E system include insufficient human resources dedicated to M&E, as well as under capacitated M&E units within implementing entities. In addition, the system faces insufficient funding and low technical capacity. Because of a lack of collaboration among the directorates within the Ministry of Health and Social Services, M&E activities are not well integrated. In spite of these challenges, the Health Sector is the most advanced in terms of M&E activities. In other government ministries, M&E activities and M&E technical expertise are even more limited (CREST Team 2010, pp. 61, 73).

**Nongovernmental Entities Engaged in M&E**

CSOs implementing HIV and AIDS intervention programs at all levels contribute to the M&E system by conducting surveys and impact assessments. The activities of these CSOs are coordinated at a national level by the umbrella organization, Namibian Network of AIDS Service Organizations, which also represents them in the National M&E Committee. This organization has developed M&E capacities by employing a full-time M&E officer for civil society activities. Since 2005, it has also secured funds for regional M&E workshops, focusing on project cycle management and general management (CREST Team 2010, pp. 63-64).

The Namibia Coalition on AIDS was established in 2003, with the support of the Namibia Chamber of Commerce and Industry and UNAIDS. It represents private sector organizations in the National M&E Committee (CREST Team 2010, p. 64).

The Southern African Network of HIV/AIDS Service Organizations is a regional network of national AIDS service organizations in Southern Africa. Its Monitoring and Evaluation Department is responsible for regional M&E processes and supporting the national ASOs. It tracks regional and national M&E processes, provides M&E capacity building to AIDS service organization members and monitors and evaluates the implementation of HIV/AIDS programs (CREST Team 2010, p. 63).

One study lists an additional organization, the Namibia Monitoring Evaluation and Research Network, but provides no additional information about it (Kenya School of Monetary Studies 2010, p. 30).

**Evaluation Capacity Building Services**

*Collaboration between Domestic Services and External Assistance*

The government of Namibia receives M&E capacity building assistance from a number of national and international sources. Since 2008, the MoHSS, the University of Namibia, the Global Monitoring and
Evaluation Team and the World Bank have together offered training courses in basic M&E and workshops in data analysis and report writing. In addition, the Institute for Capacity Development, a member of the Namibia Chamber of Commerce and Industry, is a nonpartisan independent management training and development institution offering a course in project monitoring and evaluation targeted at senior officers and managers in government, the private sector and NGOs (CREST Team 2010, pp. 62, 68).

The MEASURE project, in consultation with the Response Monitoring and Evaluation Subdivision within the Expanded National HIV/AIDS Coordination Division of the Ministry of Health and Social Services, assessed the capacity of Namibia’s national HIV/AIDS M&E system. UNAIDS, which supports efforts to unify and operationalize M&E systems, seconded an M&E advisor to the government. UNDP has helped the Government harmonize data collection systems and has provided support for databases and analysis tools. UNICEF has helped the Directorate of the HIV/AIDS Management Unit develop an M&E system and has supported M&E capacity building workshops for Regional AIDS Committees for Education (CREST Team 2010, pp. 62, 65-66).

Millennium Challenge Account - Namibia provides technical support to stakeholders to assist them in data collection. The U.S. President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief has supported a pilot of the M&E capacity building guidelines. The government has also received M&E capacity assistance from the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (CREST Team 2010, pp. 67-68).
Rwanda

Elements Supporting Demand for M&E and PM Information and Services

National Development Policy and Poverty Reduction Strategy
Rwanda’s development is guided by Vision 2020, which the Office of the President launched in 1998. Rwanda’s first Poverty Reduction Strategy started in 2000 with the purpose of operationalizing Vision 2020. In 2000, with donor support and to link development strategies and policies to the budget process and increase transparency, the government of Rwanda introduced a medium term expenditure framework that provides a basis for the annual budget (FEMA (MUK) & CPMER 2010, pp. 14-15).

Laws, Regulations, and Policies Increasing the Demand for M&E and PM Information
In 2001, the government launched the National Information and Communication Infrastructure Policy composed of four five-years plans. Its aim was to develop communication infrastructure and ICT use in the private sector and the public service, through e-government and data management systems, including M&E systems. A National Strategy for the Development of Statistics was launched for 2009-2014 to improve the national data production system on a government-wide basis (FEMA (MUK) & CPMER 2010, pp. 14-15, 17).

In 2000, the government adopted a Decentralization Policy that launched a decentralization process. In 2005, it began a second phase of the process with a reduction in the number of provinces and districts. Under this policy, line ministries are responsible for setting policy, norms and standards, overseeing the system and undertaking planning, monitoring and evaluation at the national level. In collaboration with the Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning and the Ministry of Local Government, they define the objectives, amounts and modalities of earmarked transfers to districts in their sector. Districts are in charge of service delivery and oversight of the different service delivery units (FEMA (MUK) & CPMER 2010, pp. 15-16).

Laws and Regulations Focusing on Modern Budgetary Principles
Based on the 2003 Constitution, the Organic Law on State Finances and Property (Organic Budget Law), adopted in 2006 established principles of planning, budgeting and monitoring national resources. These were further detailed in the financial regulations published in 2007 (FEMA (MUK) & CPMER 2010, p. 16).

During the 2000s, the government of Rwanda started to develop Sector Budget Support. In 2003, the Ministry of Education became the first ministry to develop a sector-wide approach, based on its Education Sector Policy. In 2006, the government and donors signed a memorandum of understanding defining a set of principles for aligning and harmonizing development partners’ support to Rwanda’s education sector. In the health sector, a sector-wide approach was launched in 2008 (FEMA (MUK) & CPMER 2010, p. 15).

Performance-based contracting practices exist in Rwanda’s health and education sectors. In 2001, a performance-based financing initiative in the health sector was launched in two districts and was later scaled-up across the country. Since 2006, the government has engaged in performance contracting.
between the President and district mayors, who report to the President on progress in implementing these contracts. In the education sector, districts develop District Education Plans indicating their priorities and corresponding targets, based on which, performance contracts are signed between school headmasters and the districts. However, one study found little information about the quality of this monitoring and reporting system (FEMA (MUK) & CPMER 2010, pp. 17-18).

The government has undertaken several actions to improve transparency and accountability. In 1998, it created the Office of the Attorney General and reformed it in 2003, establishing its reporting line to the Parliament. The Constitution of 2003 (Article 182) mandated the creation of the Office of the Ombudsman, as well as efforts to involve citizens in policy making through local participation and community scorecards. However, accountability and transparency remain limited, according to the measures of a number of international NGOs and processes. As evidence of this, in 2008, a new law banned criticism of the President and required that journalists reveal their sources in court (FEMA (MUK) & CPMER 2010, p. 18).

**Supply of M&E and PM Information and Services**

**Government M&E Entities and Systems**

A number of government entities are involved in M&E and PM. Poverty Reduction Strategy Monitoring and Evaluation, formerly “Poverty Observatoire,” within the Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning is partially responsible for M&E. Its main focus has shifted from coordinating poverty monitoring to taking responsibility for M&E more broadly (FEMA (MUK) & CPMER 2010, p. 16). In addition, ministries are also engaged in sector-specific M&E and PM efforts.

The National Institute of Statistics of Rwanda, created in 2005, is also responsible for M&E. As of 2010, the M&E process in Rwanda relied primarily on statistics gathered by the NISR through surveys, and to a much lesser extent on routine data. The Institute leads efforts to improve government capacity to make decisions grounded in evidence-based information by coordinating efforts to collect, analyze and disseminate reliable data. Its notable progress has earned it one of the higher statistical capacities in the region, according to the World Bank Statistical Capacity index (FEMA (MUK) & CPMER 2010, p. 16).

The Central Public Investment and External Finance Bureau, a semi-autonomous body in the Ministry of Finance and Economic Development, was established in 1998 to monitor donor projects. However, according to one study, it has an insufficient number of skilled personnel (FEMA (MUK) & CPMER 2010, p. 15).

**Tools and Methods**

In 2007, the Ministry of Education began developing an Education Management Information System to help improve the government’s routine data collection and to help the ministry monitor learning outcomes. Its aim was to install software and servers and provide relevant training in 5,000 schools by 2011 (FEMA (MUK) & CPMER 2010, p. 17).

In the health sector, routine data are collected by the Monitoring and Evaluation Unit of the Ministry of Health, using the Health Management Information System (FEMA (MUK) & CPMER 2010, p. 17).
In both the health and education sectors, routine data production is hampered by problems with data collection tools, definitions, classifications, and methodologies, as well as a need to invest in capacity building (FEMA (MUK) & CPMER 2010, p. 17).

**Nongovernmental Entities Engaged in M&E**

One study lists the existence of the Rwanda Evaluation Society and the Rwanda Monitoring and Evaluation Association, but provides no further information about either one (Kenya School of Monetary Studies 2010, p. 30).
South Africa

Elements Supporting Demand for M&E and PM Information and Services

Government M&E Frameworks

Laws, Regulations, and Policies Increasing Demand for M&E and PM Information.

The 1996 Constitution established the foundations for M&E in South Africa in its description of the obligations of the state and the accountability requirements of the Executive. It states that state institutions must be developmental and emphasizes the effective, transparent, and accountable utilization of public resources, with legislative oversight and incorporating public participation (CLEAR-Wits 2012, p. 147; CREST Team 2010, p. 90).

The Constitution divides government into three autonomous but interdependent spheres: local, provincial and national. South Africa is not a federal system: the national sphere sets policy, norms, and standards to be implemented by other spheres. This system of governance has implications for M&E, as provincial governments have discretion in their interpretation of central government rules and standards. As a result, national departments need to partner with provinces to reach a common interpretation of rules (CLEAR-Wits 2012, p. 144).

In addition to the 1996 Constitution of South Africa, the purview of M&E is defined through public service and public finance-related legislation, as well as sector-specific legislation. The Public Service Act of 1994, amended in 2007, and related regulations explain the functioning of national and provincial departments and the positions and responsibilities of government personnel. The Public Service Regulations of 1999 describe the government’s mandated PM approach (CLEAR-Wits 2012, p. 150).

At the local level, the Municipal Systems Act of 2000 requires municipalities to develop their own PM systems, specifying targets, publishing reports, and reviewing performance, including through local government Integrated Development Plans (CLEAR-Wits 2012, p. 148).

South Africa’s current development is guided by the Fifteen Year Review of Government, which was completed in early 2009 and provided the basis for significant investment in improving government performance. The Review’s recommendations for improving the government’s implementation capacity included improving the M&E system, giving those with oversight responsibilities powers of sanction, and emphasizing achievement of outcomes over compliance (CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 144, 148).

Laws and Regulations Focusing on Modern Budgetary Principles

**Government M&E Policy Framework**


“Improving Government Performance: Our Approach” introduced a shift to an outcomes-based approach to budgeting, building on previous advances toward output-based budgeting that had been established in the Public Financial Management Act and the Municipal Finance Management Act. The outcomes-based approach has become the overarching framework for M&E in South Africa. As the outcome-based approach is institutionalized across government, ministers and the President are establishing performance agreements and delivery agreements outlining their planned contributions to the approach’s twelve prioritized outcome areas. The delivery agreements are published as the government’s Programme of Action and are monitored on a quarterly basis (CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 144-146).

The Green Paper on National Strategic Planning highlights the link between planning and M&E. The government has introduced a process for developing a longer-term vision and plan for the country, which is being led by an advisory National Planning Commission, located in the Presidency and established in early 2010. If the Cabinet adopts the draft long-term vision and national development plan that the Commission has put forward, it will become the framework that will guide the government’s long-term performance and will set the foundation for the country’s long-term development strategies and indicators (CLEAR-Wits 2012, p. 153).

**National Evaluation Policy**

A National Evaluation Policy Framework was introduced and approved in November 2011, establishing the typology, principles and standards for evaluation. It and supporting efforts are aimed at increasing M&E capacity and promoting the use of evaluation results. In its early years, it focused on the evaluation of a limited number of strategic government priorities, proposed by sector departments and approved by Cabinet. Eight evaluations were planned for 2012/13, 15 for 2013/14, and 20 for 2014/15 (CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 146, 157).

In spite of all of this progress, challenges exist aligning the existing legislation and policies. For example, the outcomes approach of the Department of Performance, Monitoring and Evaluation in the Presidency and the performance information required by Treasury are not fully aligned and adhere to different planning systems (CLEAR-Wits 2012, p. 151).
Organizational Culture and Incentives
According to the studies, South Africa remains in the process of developing its M&E culture. In line ministries, managers, who are accustomed to the Treasury’s and the Auditor-General’s demands for annual progress reports and output indicators, lack a sense of ownership within the M&E system. In fact, the studies describe a culture of “malicious compliance” and little interest in information use (CLEAR-Wits 2012, p. 158).

Utilization of M&E and PM Information
The use of evaluation information in decision-making is limited, in part based on the culture of “malicious compliance” described above. According to the case studies, only Parliament has enforcement capacity. Thus, interesting Parliament in information is critical to promoting its use. As such, a significant responsibility for the Department of Performance, Monitoring and Evaluation in the Presidency, which is charged with leading M&E at a national level, is to work with Parliament to increase the influence of evaluation-related information on policy making (CLEAR-Wits 2012, p. 158).

Roles of Donors and Civil Society in Generating Demand
Starting in the mid-1980s, donor investments in the nonprofit sector and their accompanying accountability requirements laid the foundation for program evaluation in South Africa. During this time, donors relied heavily on external evaluation expertise, with a few exceptions. By 2000, although evaluation remained donor-driven, it incorporated more local expertise and stakeholders (CREST Team 2010, p. 79, 83, 86).

Supply of M&E and PM Information and Services
Government M&E Agencies and Systems
A number of government entities are involved in M&E and PM in South Africa. The Department of Performance, Monitoring and Evaluation in the Presidency was established in 2010 as the custodian of the government-wide M&E system. It establishes the M&E framework, undertakes evaluation and research, supports capacity development and integrates data for reporting purposes. Its 2012 budget was $20.8 million and it had 197 total staff (CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 10-11).

The location of the Department of Performance, Monitoring and Evaluation within the Presidency gives it power to ensure consistency among planning and M&E legislation and policies. However, it has no legislative backing and currently exists at the prerogative of the President. Further, it must carefully balance the need to drive results-based management with building broad ownership for the approach. This is especially evident in its leadership role advancing the outcomes-based approach. Some have expressed misgivings that, while the department’s responsibilities and accountabilities remain unclear, it has produced a number of frameworks and undertaken some activities that demand a lot of change (CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 145, 151, 162; University of Witwatersrand, Graduate School of Public and Development Management 2010, p. 7).

The National Treasury’s mandate is informed by sections 215 and 216 of the Constitution and by other legislation. The Treasury’s role in relation to government-wide M&E is to ensure that program
performance information underpins planning, budgeting, implementation management and accountability reporting. Treasury is the central custodian of quarterly reports against budgets, which include performance information, and for expenditure monitoring (CLEAR-Wits 2012, p. 151).

The Department of Public Service and Administration’s mandate is framed by the Public Service Act. It is responsible for increasing public service effectiveness and improving governance. It acts as the custodian of public management frameworks, performance and knowledge management and service delivery improvement. The department focuses on monitoring individual and management performance and has established the Public Management Watch System as part of the system for assessing public service management performance (CLEAR-Wits 2012, p. 151).

The Auditor-General is charged with auditing department financial statements and statements of program performance, following Section 20(1c) of the Public Audit Act (25 of 2004). Similar provisions exist at the municipal level of government. The Auditor-General’s reports feed into the overall monitoring process and serve as a key indicator of government institutional performance. The Auditor-General also undertakes discretionary performance audits, which are similar to evaluations. However, the Auditor-General only has powers of reporting and recommendation, not enforcement (CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 151, 158).

The Department of Cooperative Governance, which oversees local government, derives its mandate from the Constitution, Chapters 3 and 7, the Municipal Structures Act of 1998 and the Municipal Systems Act of 2000. It develops national policies and legislation related to local government, monitors their implementation and supports local government in fulfilling its constitutional and legal mandate. In addition to collating information from municipalities on their performance, it works with provincial departments on monitoring local government performance based on local integrated development plans (CLEAR-Wits 2012, p. 152).

The Office of the Premier, which is the political head of provincial government, leads the development and implementation of Provincial Growth and Development Plans. The Provincial Growth and Development Strategy guides the planning and M&E function within each province (CREST Team 2010, pp. 97-98).

Statistic’s South Africa’s mandate is informed by the Statistics Act (No. 6 of 1999), the 2002 January Cabinet Legkotla, and the State of the Nation Addresses of 2004 and 2005. It advises government entities on the application of quality criteria and standards and designates statistics produced by other government entities as official statistics. Statistics SA conducts the national census, a critical role in the evaluation process (CLEAR-Wits 2012, p. 152).

The Public Service Commission derives its mandate from sections 195 and 196 of the Constitution. It is independent from the executive and reports directly to Parliament. It is responsible for investigating, monitoring, and evaluating the organization and administration of the public service. This mandate includes the evaluation of government programs. Although the Commission produces regular reports on the state of the public service, these rarely lead to action, since the PSC only has advisory and not enforcement power (CLEAR-Wits 2012, p. 152).
Line departments, provinces and municipalities play a functional role within the M&E system. They house departmental, provincial (within the Office of the Premier) and program-specific M&E units. A document describing the role of the Premier’s Office, which was developed by the Presidency, encourages the establishment of M&E units for reporting on performance. Line departments are expected to set up their own M&E systems, aligned with the GWM&E Framework (CLEAR-Wits 2012, p. 152; CREST Team 2010, p. 99).

The National Planning Commission’s aim is to develop a 2025 Vision and to develop a long-term strategic plan (CREST Team 2010, p. 99).

In addition to all the government bodies mentioned, to ensure coordination, there are Cabinet-level clusters and intergovernmental structures. Relevant to M&E are the President’s Coordinating Council and the Meeting of Ministers and Provincial Members of the Executive. These are important, given the number of agencies involved in the M&E function and their potentially overlapping or conflicting mandates (CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 152, 166).

As noted above, in 2007 the Cabinet approved a government-wide M&E system. Support for it and therefore its rate of implementation increased after the national elections in May 2009 and the appointment of a new President and administration. Its aim was to link and synchronize existing monitoring and evaluation capacities and programs in line function departments. The M&E framework was comprised of program performance information based on departmental datasets and linked to departmental budgets; social, economic and demographic statistics drawn from Statistics South Africa’s national census and surveys, as well as departmental surveys; and evaluations and research studies. Although the system still serves as a reference point, it has been superseded by policy documents generated by the Department of Performance, Monitoring and Evaluation (CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 149-150; CREST Team 2010, pp. 79, 88-90).

To execute the Provincial Growth and Development Strategy, all provinces, except Northern Cape, have established an M&E forum to ensure M&E and planning functions coordination at the provincial level. These forums are mandated to develop a single provincial M&E framework aligned to the government-wide initiative (CREST Team 2010, p. 98).

**Evaluations Undertaken**

During the 2000s, evaluation remained largely donor-driven. Departments conducted their own evaluations and had no systematic way to share findings. Their efforts remained focused on monitoring (CLEAR-Wits 2012, p. 157).

**Tools and Methods**

The Department of Performance, Monitoring and Evaluation uses the Management Performance Assessment Tool to assess departments’ management performance. This system collates existing standards and indicators of good management into a single system, building on existing tools carried out by different departments. In June 2012, the Cabinet mandated that all departments use this tool. Although parts of the tool have been operational for some time, the approach as a whole is new and is
currently going through a gradual roll out to national departments and provinces (CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 145, 154-155).

The Presidential Frontline Service Delivery Monitoring program, which the Department of Performance, Monitoring and Evaluation also leads, includes the Presidential hotline citizen complaints management system. The Frontline program also assesses service delivery quality through unannounced visits to service delivery points, where both citizens and frontline staff are interviewed (CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 145, 156).

The Department of Performance, Monitoring and Evaluation also leads quarterly outcomes monitoring under the outcomes-based approach. The reports are broadly discussed, ultimately within Cabinet committees. Although there have been concerns about the quality and reliability of the information that make up the reports, there is a perception that this is improving (CLEAR-Wits 2012, p. 163).

The five-year Medium Term Strategic Framework is aligned to the electoral mandate and term of the Cabinet. It informs budgeting and specific strategic and annual plans, sector plans and plans at different levels of government. The framework and outcomes approach use terminology slightly differently, causing some tension (CLEAR-Wits 2012, p. 153).

Treasury leads quarterly monitoring against departmental annual performance plans (APPs) (CLEAR-Wits 2012, p. 154). The Department of Public Service and Administration is responsible for the PM and Development System, which assesses individual performance and links it to organizational performance. This is not an outcomes-oriented system; performance bonuses are often linked to the implementation of activities, rather than to their results (CLEAR-Wits 2012, p. 145-6).

Evaluation Capacity Building Services

Domestic Services
There are a range of institutions that offer M&E capacity building assistance in South Africa. The South African Monitoring and Evaluation Association, created in 2005, benefits from government engagement, which includes government participation in and funding for the association. Its activities include maintaining a web portal, developing M&E standards and guidelines, identifying stakeholders for evaluation, and hosting conferences (University of Witwatersrand, Graduate School of Public and Development Management 2010, p. 9; Valenzuela 2010, p. 20).

The Public Administration Leadership and Management Academy, previously the South African Management Development Institute, provides and commissions M&E training for public service officials in order to ensure standardization and quality of training. The M&E Capacity-Building Programme of the institute was launched in April 2008. Given the scale of training required for this program, the institute shifted from being a training provider to becoming a facilitator of training for the public sector (University of Witwatersrand, Graduate School of Public and Development Management 2010, p. 12).

In addition to already existing independent training initiatives and the government’s training academy, the government has established an M&E learning network, led by the Department of Performance,
Monitoring and Evaluation. It arranges M&E knowledge exchange and learning opportunities for public servants. The DPME has also established forums for heads of M&E at both national and provincial levels to share knowledge and help champion M&E practices across government (CLEAR-Wits 2012, p. 157).

All universities have some expertise in evaluation, although it may be more research-focused. The University of Witwatersrand offers a variety of master’s level modules and certificate courses. It has doctoral students specializing in evaluation and holds a Virtual Evaluation Conference. The University of Johannesburg offers a master’s program in evaluation and has PhD students specializing in evaluation (University of Witwatersrand, Graduate School of Public and Development Management 2010, pp. 8-9). The University of Cape Town has a master’s degree and PhD program in evaluation. Another study provides slightly different information: it reports that the Institute of Monitoring and Evaluation, an academic institute at the University of Cape Town, offers training in M&E through short courses with certificates, undergraduate courses that constitute a B.A. program, postgraduate courses with postgraduate diplomas, and a master’s degree in monitoring and program evaluation. According to this second study, the institute offers three courses annually and has 25 total staff members, including technical staff. It has a strong institutional backing and infrastructure, a permanent faculty and consistently offered trainings. The public sector is its primary client (University of Witwatersrand, Graduate School of Public and Development Management 2010, pp. 8-9; Mukasa and Kisekka-Ntale 2009, pp. 26-27).

According to one study, the University of Stellenbosch has a postgraduate diploma in M&E and PhD students specializing in evaluation. According to another study, the Department of Sociology and Social Anthropology at Stellenbosch University also offers an introduction to program evaluation methods in its master’s program in social science methods. The department offers one course per year and has three faculty members. The School of Public Management and Planning offers M&E training within its postgraduate programs at master’s and doctoral levels, as short-term executive and short courses. The school offers 4 courses per year and has 17 staff members, including technical staff. The university’s clientele is relatively balanced across sectors (University of Witwatersrand, Graduate School of Public and Development Management 2010, pp. 8-9; Mukasa and Kisekka-Ntale 2009, pp. 18-20).

Research institutes are similarly involved in M&E capacity building. The Council for Scientific and Industrial Research conducts a range of evaluations. The Human Sciences Research Council conducts a range of evaluations and designed the Expanded Public Works Programme M&E framework (University of Witwatersrand, Graduate School of Public and Development Management 2010, p. 9).

An increasing number of consulting firms undertake M&E work. Some of the more established consultancies include Khulisa Management Services, Insideout, and Southern Hemisphere (University of Witwatersrand, Graduate School of Public and Development Management 2010, p. 9).

**External Assistance**

The United Nations agencies, the World Bank and other multilateral institutions and the donor community have also played an important role in supporting M&E capacity development initiatives. For example, in 2010, the Department of Performance, Monitoring and Evaluation embarked on a project
with the UNDP to strengthen the government M&E system capacity. The University of Witwatersrand has also been engaged in this initiative (University of Witwatersrand, Graduate School of Public and Development Management 2010, p. 7).
Swaziland

Elements Supporting Demand for M&E and PM Information and Services

Government M&E Frameworks
According to one study, the government of Swaziland does not have an overarching Poverty Reduction Strategy. Instead, Swaziland’s development is guided by its National Health Sector Strategic Plan, 2008-13, under the Ministry of Health; the national multi-sectorial strategic framework for HIV and AIDS, 2009-14, led by the National Emergency Response Council of HIV/AIDS; and the Swaziland National AIDS program M&E framework, led by the Swaziland National AIDS Program (Kenya School of Monetary Studies 2010, p. 15).

Laws and Regulations Focusing on Modern Budgetary Principles
In Swaziland, the use of contract plans or performance contracting has been limited. Only three public enterprises—the Swaziland Water Service Corporation, the Swaziland Electricity Board, and the Swaziland Posts and Telecommunications Corporations—have had performance agreements with the government (Kenya School of Monetary Studies 2010, p. 7).

Supply of M&E and PM Information and Services

Government M&E Entities and Systems
Two government entities have key roles in M&E and PM. The Strategic Information Department in the Ministry of Health provides M&E data for the health sector. The M&E unit of the National Emergency Response Coordinating Authority is charged with establishing a functional national M&E framework to collect, analyze and provide feedback on HIV/AIDS program data from stakeholders (Kenya School of Monetary Studies 2010, pp. 19, 23).

According to Ministry of Health records, the Ministry employs 30 M&E officers, 14 data clerks, and 6 assistant technicians who have been trained in M&E through short courses (Kenya School of Monetary Studies 2010, p. 24).

According to the studies reviewed, Swaziland’s government M&E systems are all located in the country’s health and emergency response sectors (Kenya School of Monetary Studies 2010, p. 21).

Nongovernmental Entities Engaged in M&E
The Baphalali Swaziland Red Cross Society, the Centre for Aids Development Research and Evaluation, and the National Emergency Response Council of HIV/AIDS are engaged in M&E activities related to HIV and AIDS and emergency programs. Other national and international CSOs are engaged in M&E related to their own programs (Kenya School of Monetary Studies 2010, pp. 26, 44-5).
Tanzania

Elements Supporting Demand for M&E and PM Information and Services

National Development Policy and Poverty Reduction Strategies
The United Republic of Tanzania Vision 2025 (1995-2025) is intended to guide Tanzania’s economic and social development efforts up to the year 2025. The implementation framework for the Vision 2025 highlights the importance of monitoring and evaluation, as well as increasing government accountability (CREST Team 2010, p. 119).

The National Poverty Eradication Strategy, 1997-2000, was the first national development strategy designed to implement Vision 2025. In 1999, the strategy was complemented by Poverty and Welfare Monitoring Indicators to guide monitoring and evaluation of the poverty eradication programs and to inform policy and program decisions (CREST Team 2010, p. 120).

The poverty reduction strategy of 2000-2003 succeeded the National Poverty Eradication Strategy, maintaining alignment with the Vision 2025 document. The National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty, which was launched in 2005, replaced the poverty reduction strategy (CREST Team 2010, pp. 120, 124).

The government designed the Framework for Monitoring, Evaluation and Review of the Vision 2025 to regularly assess progress toward set outcomes and milestones. The framework included five-year reviews aimed at informing adjustments to the Vision 2025 implementation plan. It also established a communications system to help build synergies with various implementing agencies (CREST Team 2010, p. 119).

The 2001 Poverty Monitoring Master Plan guides M&E for the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper. It provides poverty trend data for national and local policy makers’ use in their strategy decision-making. The monitoring system creates links between national surveys and local and ministerial administrative data, a step toward establishing a coordinated national-level approach to data collection, analysis, and dissemination (CREST Team 2010, p. 121).

Laws, Regulations, and Policies Increasing the Demand for M&E and PM Information
In 2006, the Ministry of Planning, Economy and Empowerment issued the Tanzania National Planning Policy. It focuses on aspects of quality of life, stable environment, gender equality, and security. The policy included an M&E framework (CREST Team 2010, p. 125).

The Public Service Management and Employment Policy of 1999 and the Public Service Act, No. 8, of 2002 led to public service institutions adopting PM systems. A Performance Improvement Model was introduced to all public service institutions, requiring them to plan, monitor, evaluate and report on performance, and carry out performance reviews (CREST Team 2010, pp. 132-133).

In its second phase, Public Sector Reform has reached line and sector ministries, calling for strong and effective M&E. The government also has the Public Financial Management Reform Programme and a
series of other reforms, including Local Government Reform and Legal Sector Reform (ESAMI 2010, p. 20).

As of 2010, the Ministry of Infrastructure Development planned to establish M&E guidelines. The Planning Commission in the President’s Office similarly planned to develop Medium and Long Term M&E for Monitoring and Evaluating the National Economy (ESAMI 2010, p. 20).

**Laws and Regulations Focusing on Modern Budgetary Principles**
The National Poverty Eradication Strategy influenced the expenditure allocations in the three-year Medium Term Expenditure Framework, which was monitored by the Public Expenditure Review process. Strategic planning and M&E have also been integrated into the MTEF, with expenditures monitored and controlled through the government’s Integrated Financial Management System (CREST Team 2010, p. 133).

**Utilization of M&E and PM Information**
There is some reporting of M&E and PM information use by policy makers to inform decision making. The Parliament uses the information to inform budget approval. Because it does not have the capacity to analyze the information provided on its own, Parliament is assisted in this regard by officers in the Clerk of Parliament. The government as a whole uses M&E and PM information to help determine needs before allocating resources. The Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs uses the information to inform financial resource allocation. Finally, the Controller and Auditor General use the information for auditing financial and physical performance (ESAMI 2010, p. 22).

**Roles of Donors and Civil Society in Generating Demand**
Donors contribute directly to Tanzania’s budget and monitor performance using Tanzania’s systems, in addition to funding their own programs using their own M&E systems (CREST Team 2010, p. 133).

**Government and CSO Demand for Skills Building in M&E and PM**
The government planned to strengthen its M&E capacities by offering training to employees responsible for these functions. However, as of 2010, the budget allocated for training remained too small to address the need (ESAMI 2010, p. 20).

**Outsourcing Evaluations**
In part because of limited M&E capacity within government, the government outsources evaluations of its performance to consultants and CSOs (ESAMI 2010, p. 21; CREST Team 2010, p. 136).

**Supply of M&E and PM Information and Services**

**Government M&E Entities and Systems**
A number of government entities are engaged in M&E. In 2008, the government established the Planning Commission in the President’s Office as the think tank on the national economy. It monitors and analyzes development trends and policy effectiveness in order to advise on medium and long-term socio-economic development strategies. The Planning Commission, which consists of a small number of
core staff, relies on external expertise to perform some of its monitoring and strategic planning tasks (CREST Team 2010, pp. 119-120).

The Vice-President’s Office has overall responsibility for monitoring the implementation and impact of the poverty reduction strategy against various levels of indicators. The Poverty Monitoring Steering Committee manages the poverty monitoring system. It provides general guidance to the system and is supported by several smaller technical working groups. The Research and Analysis Technical Working Group supports the Poverty Monitoring Steering Committee and coordinates the production of a range of key national analytical reports including Tanzania’s Poverty and Human Development Report (every two years), status reports on growth and poverty status (for years when the Development Report is not produced), Briefs: Policy and Topical, Views of the People Report (2007, 2010), and periodic reports on specific research topics (CREST Team 2010, pp. 120-123).

The Survey and Routine Data Technical Working Group supports the Poverty Monitoring Steering Committee and is coordinated by Tanzania’s National Bureau of Statistics. It aims to provide timely, high-quality social and economic data for the monitoring system. The Communications Working Group supports the Poverty Monitoring Steering Committee and facilitates a timely two-way communication flow of information on the National Strategy for Growth and Reduction in Poverty (CREST Team 2010, pp. 123-124; FEMA (MUK) & CPMER 2010, p. 21).

Each ministry develops an annual budget to support the M&E sections of their Policy and Planning Divisions and the sections’ M&E activities, with levels of funding varying per ministry. Nationally, the figure set aside for 2010-2011 for M&E was approximately $928,500 (ESAMI 2010, p. 19).

Human capacity on both the supply and demand sides of M&E is reported as generally low, leading to poor data quality and use. In each M&E section, there are approximately eight staff members. However, most have not received M&E training. The Parliament of Tanzania also has a Policy and Planning Division with few staff members working on M&E, beyond their Internal Audit Unit and several watchdog committees (CREST Team 2010, p. 139; ESAMI, p. 19).

The Poverty Monitoring System is used to monitor and evaluate the National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty. Its objectives are to ensure the timely availability of data, develop adequate data storage with easy access for a variety of stakeholders, analyze data and disseminate findings to stakeholders, promote evidence-based decision making, and ensure that the targets of global initiatives, such as the MDGs, are integrated into the system and localized. The systems’ indicators rely on data from national surveys, national census data, and routine monitoring information collected by various government authorities (CREST Team 2010, pp. 121-122, 124).

The Poverty Monitoring System is mandated to ensure linkages with other monitoring and evaluation systems within the government. The outputs of the system are an annual progress report on the National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty, biannual Poverty and Human Development Reports, analytical reports on surveys, and censuses and MDG reports. The Poverty Monitoring System has produced and disseminated a number of reports. However, it has made less progress integrating
local government information into the M&E system, broadly disseminating information, and funding and resourcing major surveys, especially at the local government level (CREST Team 2010, pp. 123-124).

Departments and local government agencies collect routine monitoring data. However, coordination among data systems is often lacking. There are also often differences between data collected and information required to support decision-making processes. Local-level government entities rarely utilize the information they collect, creating a one-way information flow and little incentive for data collectors to ensure data quality and timeliness (CREST Team 2010, p. 125).

The local government M&E system seeks to address some of the weaknesses of existing routine data collection systems. It is designed to allow a bottom-up and top-down flow of information. Data that are collected at the grassroots level and sent to the national level are stored at each level and used for decision-making. Analyzed information is then shared with the grassroots level (CREST Team 2010, p. 132).

Programs in areas such as empowerment and human development, health, education, infrastructure, agriculture, and water have set up M&E systems, including community-based monitoring systems and information systems. In these also, there are problems with data quality, timeliness, and use (CREST Team 2010, pp. 125-132).

**Evaluations Undertaken**

The government undertakes internal evaluation through the production of Poverty and Human Development Reports and the public expenditure review process. Ongoing evaluation is done through Participatory Poverty Assessments, service delivery reports, and qualitative assessments, among other approaches. At the end of the National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty period in 2010, the government planned to undertake a comprehensive review of its achievements (CREST Team 2010, pp. 122-123).

**Tools and Methods**

The government of Tanzania issues a number of M&E and PM-related reports. As noted above, Poverty and Human Development Reports are produced every two years, based on information captured in the Poverty Monitoring System. Status reports on growth and poverty status, also based on Poverty Monitoring System information, are produced every year that the Poverty and Human Development Report is not produced (CREST Team 2010, p. 123).

Ministries, departments, and agencies prepare quarterly, semi-annual and annual reports on their progress implementing the National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty and their sector strategies. They base these reports on information gathered in their management information systems. The Survey and Routine Data Technical Working Group consolidates the data at the national level, and the Research and Analysis Technical Working Group analyzes them to generate national monitoring indicators for the national strategy and to produce the Annual Implementation Report (FEMA (MUK) & CPMER 2010, pp. 21-22).
Availability of M&E and PM Information

The government’s poverty monitoring website is part of the Poverty Monitoring System’s monitoring mechanism and is central to the government’s communications strategy. Performance and evaluation findings are accessible through publications available in print and electronically and posted to government agencies’ websites. The Executive and the Legislature are provided with performance reports quarterly. Civil society and the general public can access these reports on request. Development partners are provided with these reports during meetings that are held at least once every year (CREST Team 2010, p. 123; ESAMI 2010, p. 21).

Nongovernmental Entities Engaged in M&E

The Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs was not aware of any civil society plans to build their own M&E capacities and practices. Many of the NGOs engage in M&E activities related to their donors’ demands. NGOs only tend to involve government in their M&E activities when the government is a partner in their program or project. As a result, there is a lack of coordination among the many M&E activities taking place related to projects and programs. According to one study, the Tanzania Evaluation Association has not been very active (ESAMI 2010, pp. 18, 21).

Evaluation Capacity Building Services

Domestic Services

The government of Tanzania receives M&E capacity building assistance from a number of sources. The University of Dar es Salaam, the Mzumbe University, Sokoine University of Agriculture, the Institute of Rural Development Planning, Eastern and Southern African Management Institute (ESAMI 2010) and the Global Training Centre in Swaziland and Uganda offer courses in demography and population studies, including gender studies, as well as courses in M&E at various levels. However, these training programs are underfunded, which limits their capacity to deliver services and creates an unmet need for M&E training (CREST Team 2010, p. 137; ESAMI 2010, p. 20; Kenya School of Monetary Studies 2010, p. 32).

External Assistance

The International Development Evaluation Association International Institute offers short training programs in results-based monitoring, medium-term planning, and performance budgeting and also in results-based monitoring and evaluation of public programs. The International Development Research Center supports a series of training programs on poverty measurement and analysis for young researchers. Impact, in association with the Institute of Tropical Medicine, Antwerp, the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine and the University of Aberdeen, offers a short course for program managers in monitoring and evaluating maternal and neonatal health programs. USAID’s MEASURE Evaluation project offers, through the Monitoring and Evaluation Network of Training Online Resources, free online training materials on health-related M&E topics. Donors and NGOs also invest in Tanzania’s M&E capacity through their program investments (CREST Team 2010, pp. 125, 136-137).
Uganda

Elements Supporting Demand for M&E and PM Information and Services

National Development Plan and Poverty Reduction Strategies
Uganda’s Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP), 1995-2010, provided a framework for policies that address poverty. To demonstrate good governance and accountability to citizens and development partners, the government wanted to use the measures of growth and development under the plan as indicators of its performance. To do so, it needed to invest in M&E processes and systems. In the final three-year period of the PEAP’s implementation, the Office of the Prime Minister was instrumental in introducing a chapter on M&E. As a result of the office’s efforts, the government undertook the PEAP evaluation, completing it in July 2008. Its findings informed the development of Uganda’s five-year National Development Plan, 2010-2015. The government also used the evaluation to demonstrate its accountability to donors that supported the PEAP (CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 179, 188).

In addition to the PEAP, the World Bank funded Poverty Reduction Support Credits for Uganda in 2000 and 2001. These, together with the PEAP, encouraged the government and donors to develop a results-oriented framework to guide government action and support disbursement decisions (FEMA (MUK) & CPMER 2010, p. 7).

Government M&E Frameworks
In Uganda, evaluating M&E government policies and programs began in earnest with the Ugandan Constitution of 1995, which mandates the Office of the Prime Minister as the government’s lead M&E agency. Subsequent laws, such as the Local Government Act of 1997, the Budget Act of 2001, the National Planning Authority Acts of 2002, and the Public Financial and Accountability Act of 2003, further define the office’s role and that of other entities in monitoring the government’s performance and the quality of service delivery (CLEAR-Wits 2012, p. 179; FEMA (MUK) & CPMER 2010, p. 7).

Laws, Regulations, and Policies Increasing the Demand for M&E and PM Information
In 1992, Uganda launched a decentralization process to reform its local government system, promote democratization, improve service provision, and reduce poverty. District local governments are, by law, in charge of providing budget and development plans for the districts, and to monitor frontline service delivery. They are also in charge of reporting on their expenses and achievements and demonstrating adherence to the line ministries’ procedures and minimum standards of quality. The Inspection Department of the Ministry of Local Government annually assesses and classifies local governments’ performance, based on which ones receive financial rewards or sanctions (FEMA (MUK) & CPMER 2010, pp. 8-9).

Laws and Regulations Focusing on Modern Budgetary Principles
The Public Finance and Accountability Act of 2003 requires the Minister of Finance to report to Parliament on expenditure of public resources (CLEAR-Wits 2012, p. 188).
The government introduced a results-oriented management process in the public service in the early 2000s. It began to make significant advances in its implementation during the third phase of the Public Service Reform Programme, 2005-2010 (FEMA (MUK) & CPMER 2010, p. 7).

To address corruption, the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development introduced reforms such as output-based budgeting to enable national and local-level government entities to plan and budget according to clear procedures with the aim of achieving clearly stated outputs. In July 2010, the government also introduced performance contracts to be used at all levels of government (FEMA (MUK) & CPMER 2010, pp. 7, 9).

National Evaluation Policy
The government has a draft National Policy on Public Sector M&E, which is aimed at improving public sector performance. The draft policy provides for the institutional framework for national M&E and defines and harmonizes the roles, responsibilities and relationships of public institutions involved in M&E. These institutions include the Office of the President, the Office of the Prime Minister, the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development, the National Planning Authority, all sector working groups, ministries, departments, and agencies, local governments, CSOs, and the private sector (CLEAR-Wits 2012, p. 179).

Evaluation Champions
The President of Uganda is the government’s lead M&E champion. He recently led the creation of the Barazas Initiative, a new initiative aimed at gathering and responding to citizen feedback. As a show of his support, the Prime Minister chairs annual, mandatory, evaluation-focused retreats. The Resident District Commissioners, whom the President appoints to serve at the local level, are the M&E champions at that level. Institutionally, the Office of the Prime Minister is the lead champion for M&E in the country (CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 180, 184-185, 188).

Organizational Culture and Incentives
In spite of M&E’s well-placed champions, a culture of seeking M&E information to inform decision-making and improve performance is still evolving. The incentive framework for encouraging M&E practice within the public service also remains weak. In one example, while the Ministry of Local Governance has an annual performance assessment system that rewards and penalizes based on performance, it serves as an incentive to achieve certain indicators, rather than as an incentive to engage in M&E and use its findings (CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 180, 194).

Utilization of M&E and PM Information
Parliament’s demand for M&E findings to help inform decision-making remains low. Across the government, there is a lack of demand for M&E, and M&E data are rarely used in policy making. This limited utilization is attributed in part to a lack of capacity to generate and disseminate information in a timely fashion. For example, one study reports that district-level data usually arrive too late to be included in government annual performance reports for the Cabinet retreats. As a result, these data are underutilized in the policy process, whereas data and information that are included in the reports inform decisions related to sector budgets. The lack of demand for M&E and PM data is also attributed
to users’ limited understanding of how such data might help improve decision making, as well as a reticence to prioritize M&E data as input to policy formulation (CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 179-180, 185, 191, 194; ESAMI 2010, p. 28).

**Roles of Donors and Civil Society in Generating Demand**

To a large degree, donors have driven the government’s interest in investing in M&E processes and systems. Evaluations are often tied to donor funding. In some cases, donors condition funding on project achievements (CLEAR-Wits 2012, p. 184; FEMA (MUK) & CPMER 2010, p. 12).

There is some concern that, although donor pressure has contributed to the establishment of the government’s M&E systems, donors’ tendency to outsource evaluations has led to less national ownership and less use of evaluation findings. In addition, government entities can tend to prioritize M&E reporting for donors over M&E reporting for assessing and informing the improvement of public programs (CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 192, 194).

**Government and CSO Demand for Skills Building in M&E and PM**

The government is undertaking a number of efforts to increase its M&E capacity. Capacity building for M&E and PM has been prioritized in the National Development Plan. The National Planning Authority commissioned an M&E training needs assessment, to be made available in 2010. The Office of the Prime Minister has been building government M&E capacity and has recruited about 40 economists and statisticians, who have been undergoing hands-on M&E training. The Plan for National Statistical Development under the Uganda Bureau of Statistics has made good strides at strengthening administrative data systems across the country (ESAMI 2010, p. 27; CLEAR-Wits 2012, p. 180, 191, 193).

In addition, the restructuring of the Public Procurement and Disposal of Public Assets Authority included the introduction of M&E. As of 2010, the NGO Coordination Board was also establishing an M&E department (ESAMI 2010, p. 27).

**Supply of M&E and PM Information and Services**

**Government M&E Entities and Systems**

A number of government entities play M&E leadership roles. With their current roles and responsibilities, there is some duplication and inefficiency. The Draft National Policy on Public Sector M&E aims to address this (FEMA (MUK) & CPMER 2010, p. 7).

The Ugandan Constitution of 1995 created the Directorate of Policy Coordination for Monitoring and Evaluation within the Office of the Prime Minister. Its mandate is to provide leadership and coordination across government sectors, as well as oversight of government M&E activities. The office is responsible for monitoring government performance; it reports on government performance to the Cabinet every six months and annually to the Parliament. The office’s 2012 budget for M&E was $2 million, and it had 40 technical staff (FEMA (MUK) & CPMER 2010, p. 8; CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 10-11).

The Office of the Prime Minister has guided a number of M&E reforms and activities, including the explicit inclusion of M&E in the PEAP and the evaluation of the PEAP. Under its stewardship,
government institutions and development partners have supported the development of M&E systems and practices in Uganda. Although a number of M&E systems have been created as a result, this approach has also resulted in duplications and inefficiencies (CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 179-180).

The Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic Development manages sector budgets, and the Budget Monitoring and Accountability Unit monitors the implementation or execution of the budget. The unit’s predecessor, the Poverty Monitoring and Analysis Unit of this ministry, had led the poverty reduction strategy, coordinating data collection using the poverty monitoring network and coordinating the development of the National Poverty Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy (CLEAR-Wits 2012, p. 185; FEMA (MUK) & CPMER 2010, p. 8; CREST Team 2010, p. 149).

The Office of the Auditor General, whose role is defined in the 1995 Constitution and the Public Finance and Accountability Act of 2003, supplements the efforts of the Office of the Prime Minister and the Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic Development with value-for-money audits. The Auditor General reports annually to the Parliament. However, the Office of the Auditor General’s ability to fulfill its mandate is compromised by its limited control over financial resources and its lack of independence, since the President can dismiss the Auditor General. In addition, the complex system of money transfers and reporting created by the decentralization process make tracking public expenditures challenging (CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 185, 188; FEMA (MUK) & CPMER 2010, p. 10).

The Uganda Bureau of Statistics compiles and disseminates official social, economic, and demographic statistics. The bureau conducts household income and expenditure surveys every two years, demographic and health surveys every five years and the census every decade. Data disseminated by the bureau are of good quality and highly respected. The bureau also engages in poverty monitoring research. More recently, it has undertaken client satisfaction surveys that measure the quality of national service delivery (CLEAR-Wits 2012, p. 191; CREST Team 2010, pp. 149, 153).

The National Planning Authority was established by the National Planning Authority Act of 2002 to produce comprehensive and integrated development plans for the country. The Authority’s responsibilities include, among other things, monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness and impact of development programs and the economy’s performance. There is overlap between the mandates of the Authority and the Office of the Prime Minister (CLEAR-Wits 2012, p. 188; FEMA (MUK) & CPMER 2010, p. 8).

Ministries, departments, and agencies have M&E departments that are responsible for collecting data on indicators and reporting on a quarterly basis to Office of the Prime Minister and the Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic Development through an output budgeting tool (CLEAR-Wits 2012, p. 185).

Sectorial working groups consist of representatives from central ministries, technical agencies, NGOs and the donor community. These working groups coordinate sector activities and are responsible for delivering sector-wide plans and budgets and engaging in stakeholder consultations. The sectorial working groups also frequently undertake evaluations (CREST Team 2010, p. 154).
There is a general sense that the government lacks adequate supply and capacity of M&E staff to effectively design and implement M&E activities. Expertise in M&E is described as scattered in various ministries, departments, and agencies and NGOS. Most ministries, departments, and agencies, local government and district-level government entities face both human and financial resource constraints that hamper data collection and management. M&E functions are usually relegated to unit or section levels, implying limited budget allocations, as well as limited integration of M&E as a critical part of overall government efforts (CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 179-180, 193; ESAMI 2010, p. 24).

In 2003, Office of the Prime Minister led the creation of the National Integrated Management Information Strategy, which was aimed at creating a government-wide results-focused culture. This strategy, operating with PEAP, was intended to help coordinate the M&E systems of ministries, departments, and agencies, addressing both information generation and use at all levels of government. The strategy monitors PEAP using the PEAP Results and Policy Matrix; it is supported by the National Statistics System and the National Spatial Data Infrastructure. In 2006, the National M&E Working Group was established to govern and implement it (CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 11, 84, 88; FEMA (MUK) & CPMER 2010, p. 7).

The Poverty Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy, which preceded the National Integrated Management Information Strategy, is viewed as the government’s first attempt to create a unified M&E system. It defined the M&E functions of various principal government organizations, CSOs, the Uganda Evaluation Society, and development partners (CREST Team 2010, pp. 149-50).

The Government Evaluation Facility is a recent government initiative intended to further strengthen Uganda’s M&E system. Its objectives are to conduct evaluations of key government policies and to institutionalize evaluations in government. The facility is composed of a two-year rolling evaluation agenda, a Virtual Evaluation Fund, a National Evaluation Subcommittee, and a small Secretariat in the Office of the Prime Minister. A National M&E Technical Working Group comprised of all ministries, departments, and agencies and led by the Office of the Prime Minister has been established to oversee the operations of the facility. The National Evaluation Subcommittee is responsible for overseeing all government-led evaluations. In its first year of operation, 2011, the facility initiated six major evaluations (CLEAR-Wits 2012, p. 186).

The Government Evaluation Facility, like other government initiatives, is still dependent on external funding, which calls into question its sustainability. The Secretariat was established and is operational, but its capacity, as well as that of the Evaluation Subcommittee, requires strengthening. In addition, procurement regulations and processes related to contracting external consultants and transferring funds to implementing partners have led to delays in the implementation of evaluative activities (CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 181, 187).

In some cases, a group of ministries and departments has come together and formed a sector cluster to, among other things, undertake M&E activities. The accountability sector is one such example. It aims to encourage citizens’ demand for accountability, increase value for money in service delivery, and ensure compliance to procedures, effective budget preparation, tax collection, and monitoring. The primary
M&E challenge at the sector level is to harmonize data from all the M&E systems so that the Office of the Prime Minister can make them available for use (CLEAR-Wits 2012, p. 188).

The public M&E system includes ministries, departments, and agencies that run their own M&E systems, such as the Uganda Bureau of Statistics and the National Planning Authority, which perform complementary M&E roles. A task force comprised of the Office of the Prime Minister, the Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic Development, the Ministry of Public Service, the Uganda Bureau of Statistics, and the National Planning Authority engages ministries, departments, and agencies in a consultative process at the start of the budget cycle to refine their indicators, align them to government priority areas and international commitments such as the MDGs, and set indicator targets linked to annual resource allocations (CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 179, 185).

The National Development Plan acknowledged weaknesses in the government’s M&E efforts. It raised concerns about fragmentation, duplication, and a lack of coordination. It pointed to unclear results chains, challenges defining, tracking and reporting on outcomes and results, and inconsistencies in data collection methods and reporting formats, with a lack of guidelines and standards. It observed weak national ownership, inadequate feedback, a lack of sharing results within the government and with external stakeholders and poor data use. Finally, it noted inadequate capacity and financial resources devoted to M&E. It observed that M&E in Uganda remains largely donor driven (CLEAR-Wits 2012, p. 187; FEMA (MUK) & CPMER 2010, p. 11).

**National Evaluation Plans**

National evaluation plans are developed by the Government Evaluation Facility and approved by Cabinet (CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 186-187).

**Tools and Methods**

The government uses a number of tools and approaches in its M&E efforts. Government semi-annual and annual performance reports are used to measure government performance against agreed sector targets. Every sector working group submits quarterly strategic performance reports, based on which the Office of the Prime Minister reports to the Cabinet twice a year and to Parliament annually (CLEAR-Wits 2012, p. 180; FEMA (MUK) & CPMER 2010, p. 8).

Ministerial Policy Statements and Budget Framework Papers specify output and outcome indicators, as well as targets for measuring performance of respective institutions and sectors. All sector Budget Framework Papers are supposed to be results oriented monitoring compliant (CLEAR-Wits 2012, p. 190; FEMA (MUK) & CPMER 2010, p. 9).

Since 2009, the Office of the Prime Minister has organized biannual Cabinet retreats to review government performance. The Prime Minister and sometimes the President chairs the retreats and all Cabinet ministers, ministers of state, permanent secretaries and since 2011, local council chairpersons and chief administrative officers attend. In these retreats, participants assess the ministries, departments, and agencies against the performance targets they set in their Ministerial Policy Statements and develop recommendations that feed into the sector budgets for the next financial year (CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 184-185).
The output budgeting tool is used by ministries, departments, and agencies to report data to the Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic Development. This tool is the government’s largest single database of annual performance plans and budgets. The Biannual Government Performance Report provides a summary of findings from all government process evaluations facilitated through the output budgeting tool (CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 185, 191).

The government uses the Medium Term Expenditure Framework to undertake budget planning and expenditure controls. Sectorial and district-level budget framework papers inform the national budget and describe how sectors and districts plan to achieve PEAP goals (CREST Team 2010, p. 152).

All ministries, departments, and agencies and local governments report quarterly on their budget expenditure and outputs to the Budget Monitoring and Accountability Unit. This unit then undertakes field visits and audits to verify the reports in priority sectors such as agriculture, education, energy, health, industrial parks, roads, and water and sanitation. Twice a year the unit produces a Budget Performance Report, informed by the ministries, departments, and agencies and local government reports and field visits (FEMA (MUK) & CPMER 2010, pp. 8-9).

The National Planning Authority is in charge of producing the Annual National Development Report, summarizing the country’s progress toward achieving the National Development Plan goals. The Authority presents the report to the Parliament. The National Integrated Management Information Strategy uses data from a wide range of sources to compile the six monthly National Policy and Program Performance Status Report (FEMA (MUK) & CPMER 2010, p. 8; CREST Team 2010 pp. 150-151).

To encourage citizens’ participation in development cycles, the President initiated the Barazas Initiative and the Office of the Prime Minister launched it in 2009. It is a forum where citizens meet with local government officials to hold them accountable for resources spent on public programs. The changes that have resulted from Barazas demonstrate progress toward service delivery improvement and increased accountability. Where these changes have taken place, there is an increased sense of government program ownership by local communities. However, Barazas also face challenges. It needs to be introduced in more districts and sub-counties, provide prompt feedback and response to citizens’ concerns, improve their facilitation for citizens, and manage citizens’ and local governments’ expectations (CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 181, 183, 197-198).

**Evaluations Undertaken**

Evaluation is still nascent within the government of Uganda. It is estimated that only about 10 percent of project investments in the country have undergone evaluations. The National Household Survey of 1992 was the government’s first major evaluation process. In 2011, its first year of operation, the Government Evaluation Facility initiated six major evaluations (CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 184, 186, 194).

The Office of the Prime Minister has proposed a two-year rolling evaluation agenda. This will be developed by the Evaluation Subcommittee of the National M&E Technical Working Group and will outline two to three key evaluations to be undertaken each year. Two studies were conducted in 2008 and 2009, with one mapping evaluation practice and capacity across Uganda and the other assessing the feasibility of establishing an evaluation and evaluative research mechanism (ESAMI 2010, p. 27).
Sectorial working groups, jointly with other stakeholders and especially development partners, conduct annual reviews, as appropriate. The Ministry of Local Government conducts the Annual Review of Performance of Local Governments for all districts (CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 179-180).

**Systems in Place to Ensure Data Quality**

There are many concerns about the governments’ M&E capacity and ability to ensure data quality. Tools have not responded to contextual and policy changes. The quality of administrative data is low. Many institutions do not have operational management information systems for collecting, storing and retrieving data. Further, many institutions lack the technical capacities necessary to compile, maintain, and update the databases (CLEAR-Wits 2012, p. 180).

**Availability of M&E and PM Information**

The public is increasingly demanding performance information. Through its decentralization policy, the government is making this information available. The media, the Parliament, and the CSOs are also increasingly obtaining and disseminating government performance information to the public. However, M&E data is not always disseminated widely, and the public is often unaware how frequently this information should be made available to them. Most ministries, departments, and agencies have also not yet developed client service or service delivery charters (ESAMI 2010, pp. 27-28).

Some ministries, departments, and agencies, such as the Bureau of Statistics, the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Education and Sports, and the Uganda Revenue Authority, have databases that contain relatively high-quality and current data that are analyzed and disseminated to key stakeholders. However, most lack the capacity necessary to develop and maintain such systems. The Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic Development’s output budgeting tool database serves as the government’s largest resource for annual performance plans and budgets (CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 180, 191).

**Nongovernmental Entities Engaged in M&E**

CSOs participate in government M&E efforts in a number of ways. At the local government level, NGOs are members of the technical planning committee and submit evaluation reports to the district planning committee. Information from NGOs is used to inform local government resource allocation (CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 185-186).

NGOs, primarily through their umbrella organizations such as the Development Network of Indigenous Voluntary Associations, the Uganda Debt Network and the NGO Forum, also issue periodic reports on government performance as related to the National Development Plan and, previously, the PEAP. CSOs and particularly the Uganda Debt Network and the NGO Forum were actively engaged in the development of the PEAP, although one study observed that, since the PEAP, the NGO Forum has not been very effectively engaged in M&E at the macro level. The Uganda Debt Network is active in budget monitoring. Since 2004, the Uganda Governance Monitoring Platform, a civil society consortium comprising 17 NGOs, has produced an annual governance status report. However, it remains unclear how NGO M&E data feed into the government’s M&E data (CLEAR-Wits 2012, pp. 185-186; ESAMI 2010, pp. 26-27).
Several NGOs, like the Uganda Debt Network, strive to foster local participation. This network coordinates a Community-Based Monitoring and Evaluation System in more than 10 districts that involves a network of more than 6,000 community monitors. However, because initiatives like these depend largely on external funding from development agencies or NGOs, they lack autonomy and sustainability. This sort of effort is important, since civil society participation has been identified as a gap in Uganda’s Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper M&E, according to a study carried out by the Operations Evaluation Department of the African Development Bank (FEMA (MUK) & CPMER 2010, p. 11).

National and international NGOs have developed their own M&E systems. The linkage between these systems and the government M&E system is unclear. The M&E indicators used by most of the NGOs are not aligned with those of the government, creating parallel M&E systems (CLEAR-Wits 2012, p. 179).

Makerere University-affiliated national institutes, such as the Economic Policy Research Centre, the Centre for Basic Research and the Makerere Institute of Social Research, all engage in poverty monitoring research. Makerere’s Institute of Social Research and the African Capacity Building Foundation-funded Economic Policy Research Centre, also based at Makerere University, are regularly involved in designing and implementing M&E studies (CREST Team 2010, p. 149; CLEAR-Wits 2012, p. 186).

Two national evaluation associations exist in Uganda: the Uganda Evaluation Association, formed in 2002, and the African Evaluation Association in Uganda. The former has members working in the central government, while the latter has a number of members in the CSOs. Neither of these umbrella bodies has been consistently active (ESAMI 2010, p. 23).

**Evaluation Capacity Building Services**

**Domestic Services**

In 2006, the USAID-funded Uganda Monitoring and Evaluation Management Services project provided a roster of Ugandan firms, institutions and individual consultants providing M&E services. The roster identified 18 Uganda firms, 11 institutions, and 75 individuals that were assessed as having experience, qualifications, and credibility in providing M&E services. However, in spite of this pool of consultants, the 2009 National Integrated Management Information Strategy study reports that, most view the local Ugandan M&E capacity as weak (FEMA (MUK) & CPMER 2010, p. 12).

The Uganda Management Institute in Kampala is the main training body of public managers in Uganda and is recognized by statute. It was created in 1969 and in 1992 had its mandate broadened. It offers training in M&E as short and postgraduate courses, as a core module of some academic programs leading to a postgraduate diploma, through tailored courses, and as M&E-related training. It recently developed a postgraduate diploma in M&E. As of 2009, it offered 11 courses per year, had 7 technical faculty members, and served 905 students annually. It benefited from strong institutional backing and infrastructure and consistently offered trainings. The public sector is its primary client (CREST Team 2010, p. 163; FEMA (MUK) & CPMER 2010, p. 13; Mukasa and Kisekka-Ntale 2009, pp. 15-17).
In various academic institutions, M&E is taught as a subsidiary subject, more commonly through customized short courses. Uganda Christian University in Mukono offers a postgraduate diploma in M&E. It developed an M&E training package together with the Uganda Evaluation Association. In most other cases, M&E is a module in Project Management. At Makerere University, the Institute of Statistics and Applied Economics, the Faculty of Economics and Management, and the Institute of Information Technology are all institutions that offer training in data collection and quantitative analysis (CREST Team 2010, p. 168; CLEAR-Wits 2012, p. 193; ESAMI 2010, p. 27).

The Makerere Institute of Social Research, a public nonprofit research institution of Makerere University, also offers training courses in M&E through short classroom based courses where participants receive a certificate of participation and as part of a research methodology course. As of 2009, it offered three courses per year and had four technical faculty members. It offered courses as an annual regularized program and based on client demand, and served clientele from all sectors. The institute was contracted by the OPM to train members of the National M&E Technical Working Group, with funding from the World Bank (Mukasa and Kisekka-Ntale 2009, pp. 23-24; FEMA (MUK) & CPMER 2010, p. 13).

External Assistance

A number of donor agencies have been instrumental in advancing M&E skills in Uganda. The United Kingdom’s Department for International Development has provided support to public sector management and reform. Both the United Nations Development Programme and the UN Children’s Fund have focused on poverty monitoring. The Danish International Development Agency has supported the Uganda Bureau of Statistics and M&E activities in the agriculture and water sectors (CREST Team 2010, p. 168).

Working with the government-funded Economic Policy Research Centre staff, World Bank researchers have pioneered several monitoring instruments in Uganda, such as Public Expenditure Tracking and Participatory Poverty Assessment. These have subsequently been adopted in other countries, but have not gotten much traction in Uganda due to a greater focus on budget monitoring (FEMA (MUK) & CPMER 2010, p. 12).

USAID is one of the largest donor agencies in Uganda and has provided support to numerous projects across various sectors. USAID prioritizes monitoring and evaluation and frequently commissions evaluation studies or funds supporting M&E activities. Some NGOs have also provided M&E capacity building and developed M&E guides and tools as part of their programs and projects (CREST Team 2010, pp. 161, 164-166).
Zambia

Elements Supporting Demand for M&E and PM Information and Services

National Development Policies/Plans and Poverty Reduction Strategies
In its Fifth National Development Plan (2006-2010), the government of Zambia introduced a comprehensive implementation and M&E framework for each plan pillar. In its 2010 national budget the government stressed the importance of M&E to advance the National Development Plan’s implementation (ESAMI 2010, pp. 30, 33).

Government M&E Frameworks

Laws, Regulations, and Policies Increasing the Demand for M&E and PM Information
Zambia adopted a decentralization policy in the 1990s. The M&E and PM systems have experienced delays in their roll-out at all levels of government. Development partners, such as the UK Department for International Development, have encouraged the government to undertake project monitoring and regular review missions and have helped the government develop a local government performance appraisal system to be utilized by district M&E staff (ESAMI 2010, p. 33).

Laws and Regulations Focusing on Modern Budgetary Principles
The government’s budget and public sector reforms aim to bring coherence between the Sixth National Development Plan (2011-2015), the budget and the Medium Term Expenditure Framework. To accomplish this, the government must establish a monitoring and evaluation process and a performance information and management system.

The Public Sector Reform Strategy includes the Public Expenditure Management and Financial Accountability Reform Programme, which is critical for meeting economic growth and poverty reduction targets (ESAMI 2010, pp. 33-34).

Reforms in Zambia have been challenged by weak implementation and inadequate M&E capacity to assess progress being made (ESAMI 2010, p. 36).

Utilization of M&E and PM Information
Various parts of government use M&E information. The Parliament provides oversight through specialized parliamentary committees, although most members of Parliament lack sufficient capacity to analyze statistics and evaluation findings. Program managers in line ministries use M&E information to assist in program implementation. The Ministry of Finance and National Planning uses M&E and PM information to inform budget preparation and accountability and oversight activities. Accounting and audit bodies use M&E and PM information to assist in their provision of public expenditure management oversight (ESAMI 2010, pp. 35-36).

Government and CSO Demand for Skills Building in M&E and PM
As of 2010, the government was implementing a results-oriented M&E project, with World Bank support. Based on the lessons learned implementing the Fifth National Development Plan, the
government decided to strengthen government-wide monitoring and evaluation systems under the Sixth National Development Plan. To accomplish this, the Ministry of Finance and National Planning sought formal input from M&E experts and practitioners (ESAMI 2010, p. 35).

Around 2010, the government of Zambia also commissioned a needs assessment and started developing a national M&E training program (ESAMI 2010, p. 33).

**Supply of M&E and PM Information and Services**

**Government M&E Entities and Systems**

While a number of government entities are involved in M&E, two serve in leadership roles. The Monitoring and Evaluation Department in the Ministry of Finance and National Planning is responsible for reporting on the National Development Plan’s implementation performance, as well as budget monitoring and tracking. However, according to one study, the ministry lacks sufficient skilled analysts and M&E staff to adequately perform its roles (ESAMI 2010, pp. 31, 36).

The Central Statistical Office, also in the Ministry of Finance and National Planning, provides basic statistics for all functions of government. The Director of this office carries out all censuses and surveys and uses a centralized statistical service to coordinates social and economic statistics (ESAMI 2010, p. 31).

In one study, an additional nine government bodies also involved in M&E are listed. A challenge for the government is clarifying the M&E roles and responsibilities of these entities and ensuring linkages among them. Another challenge the government is facing is identifying sufficient numbers of skilled M&E staff to fill M&E positions (ESAMI 2010, p. 36).

According to one study, Zambia has one of the most comprehensive M&E systems in the region, with each sector in the country’s development plan reporting on a small number of key performance indicators. The plan includes participatory M&E approaches, promotes building M&E capacity at all levels, and creates opportunities for M&E data and information use. However, the government lacks an integrated national M&E system. Line ministries have their own M&E systems, based on the M&E framework at the Ministry of Finance and National Planning. Yet these remain uncoordinated (ESAMI 2010, pp. 32, 36).

In addition, there is a lack of coordination between M&E systems in the public sector and those designed and used by CSOs. Although the government has incorporated CSOs in their M&E mechanisms, CSOs’ M&E systems do not seem aligned to the government M&E system. This is, in part, due to emphasis on different types of measures. The Civil Society for Poverty Reduction NGO network is reported to have resisted aligning its M&E with that of the government because the government was interested in activity and output-level indicators, while the Civil Society for Poverty Reduction was more interested in measures at the outcome and impact levels. As a result, there are two parallel M&E systems (ESAMI 2010, p. 34).
**Tools and Methods**
The government uses a number of M&E tools and approaches. The Ministry of Finance and National Planning produces the Annual Economic Report. There are also the annual progress report, the Performance Assessment Framework for Poverty Reduction Budget Support, and the quarterly M&E newsletter that reports on M&E progress (ESAMI 2010, p. 31).

**Evaluations Undertaken**
The government devotes a large amount of its M&E implementation calendar to poverty and social impact analysis. However, sector and ministerial activity monitoring and evaluations predominate. Donor monitoring and tracking are also significant (ESAMI 2010, p. 34).

**Availability of M&E and PM Information**
The government makes monitoring data available to NGOs at all levels. The government disseminates information through websites, its monitoring and evaluation newsletter and representation of CSOs in Sector Advisory Groups and other government entities (ESAMI 2010, pp. 32, 35).

The media provides M&E information to the public. However, the electronic media is still building its capacity to do so (ESAMI 2010, p. 34).

**Nongovernmental Entities Engaged in M&E**
Civil Society for Poverty Reduction is a network of NGOs engaged in monitoring and evaluating the government’s poverty reduction efforts. It has been involved in the government’s Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper formulation, and it tracks government’s financial commitments and use of public resources. It is one of few civil society entities involved in M&E at the macro level (ESAMI 2010, p. 30).

Other CSOs are implementing their own M&E frameworks, including the Zambia Association of Manufacturers, the Zambia AIDS Commission, and other professional bodies and associations. Most NGOs are involved in sector-specific and/or program- or project-specific M&E, often as a result of donor requirements, but many have weak M&E systems and capacity. The Zambian Evaluation Association has been involved in some evaluations in the country (ESAMI 2010, p. 32).

**Evaluation Capacity Building Services**

**Domestic Services**
As part of its results-oriented M&E project, supported by the World Bank, the government is developing an M&E training program and offering training sessions and workshops through collaboration with local training institutions, such as the University of Zambia and the National Institute of Public Administration. Together, they are designing new courses and strengthening existing short courses and modules in M&E (ESAMI 2010, 33).

**External Assistance**
As noted, the Department for International Development and the World Bank have played significant roles supporting Zambia’s efforts to develop an effective M&E system and adequate M&E capacity (ESAMI 2010, pp. 30, 33).
Zimbabwe

Elements Supporting Demand for M&E and PM Information and Services

Government M&E Frameworks

Laws, Regulations, and Policies Increasing the Demand for M&E and PM Information
The Government of Zimbabwe’s Short Term Emergency Recovery Plan is aimed at ensuring political stability, good governance and social protection and promoting macroeconomic stabilization. One study lists other laws in this category, but does not explain their inclusion (Kenya School of Monetary Studies 2010, pp. 15, 18).

Laws and Regulations Focusing on Modern Budgetary Principles
The government’s three-year Macro-economic Policy and Budget Framework (December 2009) recognizes the importance of M&E in decision-making processes and prioritizes the involvement of the Central Statistics Office in the national budget process. The New Statistics Act creates a mandate for data collection and analysis in the country. Laws focused on public finance management and audits similarly support the need for accountability, transparency and results (Kenya School of Monetary Studies 2010, pp. 15, 18).

Utilization of M&E and PM Information
The government uses M&E information to varying degrees to inform decision-making. One study reports that the Parliament makes limited use of M&E information in informing the budget formulation process. Program managers in line ministries use M&E information to assist in the implementation of their work plans. Use of M&E information for planning, monitoring, and budgeting is unclear. Auditing bodies use M&E information for the purpose of interrogating government financial allocation and performance (Kenya School of Monetary Studies 2010, pp. 49-50).

Supply of M&E and PM Information and Services

Government M&E Entities and Systems
The Policy Coordination and Advisory Service within the Office of the Prime Minister coordinates the Government-wide Monitoring and Evaluation System (Kenya School of Monetary Studies 2010, pp. 23, 40).

The government-wide M&E System aims to improve governance and increase public sector effectiveness by reporting on government program implementation, facilitating analysis of government performance and improving M&E practice (Kenya School of Monetary Studies 2010, pp. 19, 21).

Nongovernmental Entities Engaged in M&E
National and international CSOs and their networks engage in M&E related to their own programs. One study notes that the Zimbabwe Evaluation Society exists, but its activities are not described (Kenya School of Monetary Studies 2010, pp. 30, 42-43).
Evaluation Capacity Building Services

Domestic Services
To assist in M&E and PM capacity building, the National University of Science and Technology offers a master’s of science degree in project management and the University of Zimbabwe offers a diploma in project management (Kenya School of Monetary Studies 2010, p. 32).

External Assistance
The United Nations Development Programme Zimbabwe, under the United Nations Development Assistance Framework, is supporting the government’s M&E capacity building under the Ministry of Economic Planning and Finance (Kenya School of Monetary Studies 2010, p. 29).
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APPENDIX 1: Initiatives and Organizations Contributing To The Regional and Global Supply of M&E and PM Information and Services

A number of the suppliers of M&E and PM capacity building identified in the reports offer their services in more than one country. Some are based in Sub-Saharan Africa, and others are based outside the region.

The African Evaluation Association, created in 1999, is an umbrella association for national evaluation associations and a resource for evaluators in countries without national networks. It is based in Ghana but serves all Africa. Its objectives include promoting evaluations that contribute to development in Africa; promoting Africa-rooted and Africa-led evaluation; encouraging the development and documentation of high quality evaluation theory and practice; establishing and supporting national African evaluation associations and special evaluation interest groups; facilitating capacity building, networking and information sharing on evaluation among evaluators, policy makers, researchers and development specialists; and sharing African evaluation perspectives and expertise at relevant forums (Valenzuela 2010, p. 19).

The International Initiative for Impact Evaluation is a nonprofit organization created in 2008 and based in India that provides evaluation capacity building globally. Specifically, the initiative provides funding and technical expertise to support rigorous impact evaluations in low and middle-income countries. It offers courses in impact evaluation, often in partnership with others (Valenzuela 2010, pp. 5-6).

The MS-Training Centre for Development Cooperation is a nonprofit institution based in Arusha, Tanzania; it is able to deliver courses elsewhere as well. It offers M&E and PM training through short courses, as an elective module in the Centre’s Ordinary Bachelor's in Development Studies, and as tailored courses. It offers three courses annually but can also produce courses based on client demand. It has a permanent faculty and a clientele drawn from all sectors (Mukasa and Kisekka-Ntale 2009, pp. 25-26).

MDF/East and Southern Africa is a regional office of a worldwide management training and consultancy organization. Formed in 1984, it is based in Arusha, Tanzania, and has branches in other parts of Sub-Saharan Africa. It provides M&E and PM capacity development through short courses and tailored courses, based on client demand. It offers three courses annually and has a 10-member technical staff. Its clientele is balanced across all sectors (Mukasa and Kisekka-Ntale 2009, pp. 21-22).

The Centre for Performance Management and Evaluative Research is a private institute/think tank that was founded in 2008; it is based in Uganda but serves all of Africa. It offers certificate courses in M&E and PM, based on client demand. It has 15 permanent faculty members. Its clientele is balanced across all sectors (Mukasa and Kisekka-Ntale 2009, pp. 24-25).

MEASURE is a global, USAID-funded program, first created in 1984 and then revised in 2003. MEASURE offers M&E capacity building focused on population, health, and nutrition through short courses and technical assistance (Valenzuela 2010, pp. 8-10).
The *Development Impact Evaluation* Initiative is a World Bank initiative under the Development Economics Vice-Presidency. It is based in Washington, DC, but covers all Africa. The initiative promotes the embedding of prospective impact evaluations in project designs (Valenzuela 2010, pp. 11-12).

**Statistical Capacity** is a resource provided by the Statistical Development and Partnership Team of the World Bank’s Development Data Group. It is based in Washington, DC, and serves World Bank client countries. Statistical Capacity offers four programs aimed at helping client countries build their statistical capacity (Valenzuela 2010, pp. 4-5).

The *Network of Networks for Impact Evaluation* is comprised of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development - Development Assistance Committee Evaluation Network, the United Nations Evaluation Group, the Evaluation Cooperation Group, and the International Organization for Cooperation in Evaluation. It is based in Washington, DC, and was founded in 2006. The Network’s objective is to promote more and better impact evaluations among its members by sharing methods and learning-by-doing. It offers resources on impact evaluation and has a preliminary online database of evaluations (Valenzuela 2010, pp. 16-17).

The *Africa Impact Evaluation Initiative* is a program within the World Bank’s Africa Region that supports capacity development for impact evaluation and provides technical assistance to produce country-specific impact evaluations of public programs. It serves all Africa. AIM uses a learning-by-doing approach to capacity building (Valenzuela 2010, pp. 12-14).

The *Institute of Empirical Research in Political Economy* is a nonprofit organization that specializes in training and empirical research in the evaluation of public policy. It was founded in 2004 and serves all Africa. The institute trains African students at the master’s degree level in advanced empirical research (Valenzuela 2010, p. 15).

The *African Economic Research Consortium* is a nonprofit organization devoted to the advancement of economic policy research and training. It was established in 1988 and serves all of Sub-Saharan Africa. Its training program supports both master’s and doctoral level studies in economics (Valenzuela 2010, pp. 14-15).

**AFRISTAT** is an international organization created by a treaty in 1993 in Abidjan signed by 14 member countries of Francophone Africa. It now has 18 members. AFRISTAT’s mission is to contribute to the development of economic statistics and social environment in its member states and strengthen their skills in these areas. AFRISTAT advises the National Statistical Institutes of member states and works to harmonize concepts, standards, and statistical methods. AFRISTAT also promotes regional and economic integration by aiming for consistency and better comparability of statistical data. It supports national statistical offices in data collection, processing and dissemination, as well as in data analysis and interpretation. Its main activities are onsite technical assistance and training through seminars and workshops, as well as occasional regional or sub-regional workshops on relevant topics (Valenzuela 2010, pp. 20-21).
The **International Development Evaluation Association** is an independent membership organization created in 2002. Its mission is to “improve and extend the practice of development evaluation by refining knowledge, strengthen capacity, and expanding networks for development evaluation, particularly in developing and transition countries.” It holds a biennial conference and dedicated workshops, offering networking and alliance building. It participates in the development, harmonization, and implementation of good practice and international standards in development evaluation, in collaboration with other interested organizations. It develops, maintains, and shares a knowledge base, including through peer reviews, with a focus on methods, good practice, standards, and lessons learned. It promotes the publication and dissemination of papers on development evaluation practice. It issues regular announcements, reviews and suggestions, communicated via its website, periodic newsletters and regular email communication (Valenzuela 2010, pp. 18-19).

The **International Organization for Cooperation in Evaluation** is an alliance of regional and national evaluation associations, societies, and networks that was created in 2006. Its goal is to build evaluation capacity and leadership in developing countries, facilitate the sharing of ideas within the global evaluation community, address challenges in evaluation, and encourage and strengthen evaluation internationally (Valenzuela 2010, pp. 17-18).

The **Joint Venture on Managing for Development Results** is a subsidiary of the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development - Development Assistance Committee. To advance Managing for Development Results, the Joint Venture identifies and disseminates good practice. It has developed guidance tools and principles, and it has partnerships with regional communities of practice. The African Community of Practice is a virtual community of more than 1,100 members from 87 countries, 40 of which are African (Valenzuela 2010, pp. 10-11).

The **Spanish Trust Fund for Impact Evaluation** is a trust fund within the World Bank, funded mainly by the Spanish government and managed by the Human Development Network. The Fund supports up to five field-based impact evaluation workshops per year to build client, staff, and donor capacities. It also has funding mechanisms and disseminates evaluation results through its database (Valenzuela 2010, pp. 15-16).

The **United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF)** is an international organization and part of the United Nations family. UNICEF developed an evaluation policy that its Executive Board approved in 2008. One of the objectives of this policy is to strengthen the capacity of cooperating government agencies, NGOs, and local communities to monitor and evaluate. UNICEF uses two tools at the country level to accomplish this task. The Integrated Monitoring, Evaluation and Research Plan is a tool to ensure that UNICEF and partners have the data they need to manage their programs. It is an integral part of UNICEF Results Based Program Planning and Management. The Country Program Evaluation focuses on information needed for strategic decision-making and improving overall Country Program performance. UNICEF is currently developing a methodology for country program evaluation, building on a series of pilot country evaluations (Valenzuela 2010, p. 17).
APPENDIX 2: Demand And Supply of Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) and Performance Management (PM) Information And Services in Sub-Saharan Africa: A Conceptual Framework - March 13, 2013*

COUNTRY: ____________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELEMENTS SUPPORTING DEMAND FOR M&amp;E AND PM INFORMATION AND SERVICES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Development Policies/Plans and Poverty Reduction Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>List</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Government M&E Frameworks**
(Existing national and sectorial M&E frameworks that lead to demand for M&E and PM information)

- Laws, regulations, and policies regarding the production of and access to M&E and PM information regarding public programs
- Budget laws and regulations focusing on modern budgetary principles (e.g., transparency, results-based focus, requirements to report on expenditures, etc.)
- Government M&E Policy Framework
- National evaluation policy

**Public Sector Management Reforms**
(Ongoing or planned public sector management reforms with implications for M&E and/or PM demand)

- Public sector and/or budget reforms with a focus on results, including those at the sub-national levels
- Reforms emphasizing transparency and accountability (e.g., access to information, reporting to Parliaments, “town-hall meetings” regarding public programs)

**Organizational Culture and Incentives**

- Organizational culture that promotes M&E and PM and use of findings
- Career incentives/ reward systems that promote M&E and PM and use of findings

**Evaluation Champions**

- Existence of influential champions pushing for the institutionalization of monitoring and evaluation
### Utilization of M&E and PM Information

Use of M&E and PM information for planning, budgeting, program design, accountability and/or demonstrating effectiveness by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parliament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prime Minister’s Office or the Presidency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central ministries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program managers in line ministries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Planning ministries for budgeting (outcome-based budgeting) and programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting and auditing bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Roles of Donors and Civil Society in Generating Demand

Demands tied to donor funding creating demand for M&E services

Demands tied to donor funding diverting attention from monitoring and evaluating national priorities

### Demand for M&E and PM Capacity Building

Any government initiatives to build M&E and PM capacity at the national, regional, or local levels etc., including an assessment of gaps in personnel and skills

Civil society plans for building their own portfolios in, and capacity for, monitoring and evaluating public programs, including an assessment of the gaps in personnel and skills

### Outsourcing Evaluations

Government provisions for engaging professionals or institutions in M&E of public programs
| **Government M&E Entities and Systems**  
*Existence of a key central agency and/or units within ministries specifically responsible for coordinating or conducting M&E and PM work such as statistical agencies, agencies that conduct evaluations etc.* |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>List of agency(ies) or unit(s), if they exist (national, sectoral, program, project)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stats/ M&amp;E</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Well established? By law? With what authority? Links with MDAs? Harmonized with other entities?)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language of the M&amp;E system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location of functions of the national M&amp;E system</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Functions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Presidency/Prime Minister's Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Ministry or Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budgets allocated for M&amp;E units and staff</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Functions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds allocated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resources – number and capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How are the funds used?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources sufficient, given mandates?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor-funded?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specific human and financial resources devoted to M&amp;E</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Functions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources devoted to monitoring vs. evaluation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How are the resources used?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National evaluation plan</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National evaluation plan or articulation of national evaluation priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluations undertaken</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sectoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tools and Methods</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*M&E tools and/or methods specifically tailored to meet the performance information needs of the M&E system (e.g., logic frameworks, indicators, specified periodicity of data reporting, requirements for specific self/external evaluations, performance audits)* |
| **List** |
| **Description** |
### Systems in place to ensure data quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Availability of M&amp;E and PM Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publicly available M&amp;E and PM information and evaluations findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency and type of M&amp;E and budget performance reporting to the executive, legislature, civil society, and the general public</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Nongovernmental Entities Engaged in M&E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nongovernmental Entities Engaged in M&amp;E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent bodies, including academic institutions, think tanks, civil society organizations, engaged in M&amp;E and performance audits, including of public programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence and visibility of professional M&amp;E associations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Evaluation Capacity Building Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Capacity Building Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Domestic</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other domestic agencies, or private sector institutions such as M&amp;E consulting firms, public and private universities, think tanks and research institutions, training institutions, or non-governmental organizations, that are providing M&amp;E or PM capacity building services and/or evaluation services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any external assistance, such as donor initiative’s and programs, providing M&amp;E or PM capacity building services at the national, regional, and local levels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please note that not all that the studies did not necessarily contain information in all areas of the conceptual framework*