Monitoring and Evaluation –
No Magic Wand
Results from a Cross-Donor Study
Holger Nauheimer

This project is
funded by
the European Union

Why do we monitor or evaluate?

Control

Accountability

Learning

(Better Projects?)

This project is
funded by
the European Union

Let's not forget the Aid Agenda - are we doing this?

1. Focus the dialogue on results at all stages
2. Align programming, monitoring, and evaluation with results
3. Keep measurement and reporting simple
4. Manage for, not by, results
5. Use results information for learning and decision-making

This project is
funded by
the European Union

The simple truth

This project is
funded by
the European Union

Joint Monitoring Workshop   12-15 October 2010

Common Issues

(1) Quality of M&E frameworks

(2) Framework to application gap

(3) Resources for M&E

(4) Quality of information

(5) Process alignment

(6) Systematic development of local capacities

(7) Ownership and participation

(8) Facing complexity and that there is no simple truth

This project is funded by the European Union

GFA Consulting Group   idom Consultoría

The Attribution Gap

Highly Aggregated Impact

Impact (= Indirect Benefit)

Attribution Gap

Outcome (= Direct benefit)

Use of Output

Output

Activities

Core Problem

The complexity of the project determines the location of the attribution gap

This project is funded by the European Union

GFA Consulting Group   idom Consultoría

3

Different Points of Departure

Recipient's
motivation
to do M&E

Donor's
motivation
to do M&E

Recipients and donors have different interests when
it comes to M&E of Development Aid

Joint M&E systems should be based on
what both hold in common.

This project is
funded by
the European Union

"Musts" of Joint M&E Systems

(1) Alignment of M&E frameworks with
    recipient government's processes and needs
(2) Joint performance assessment framework
(3) Responsibility of monitoring is for the partner
    government.
(4) M&E is a dialogue process.
(5) Mind the attribution gap.
(6) M and E are separate functions (internal vs.
    external)

This project is
funded by
the European Union

There is another simple truth

THE QUALITY OF M&E RESULTS DEPENDS LARGELY ON THE QUALITY OF THE M&E SYSTEM OF THE RECIPIENT COUNTRY:

This project is
funded by
the European Union

The Big Question of M&E

How are results turned into wisdom,
i.e. better programmes?

This project is
funded by
the European Union

Don't forget the simple truth

This project is
funded by
the European Union

As simples as that…

The choice of methodology for M&E depends on:

(1) the objectives

(2) costs and resources

(3) local ownership

(4) maturity of the recipient country's institutions

(5) monitoring capacity

(6) organizational cultures (on both sides)

(7) willingness to learn

(8) etc.

This project is
funded by
the European Union

and the consequence is

Monitoring and Evaluation
- can not be fully standardized
- are both completely different sides of the coin and must be separated
- must separate the two sides of the attribution gap
- must separate control and learning
- need local capacity building
- would benefit from new tools and methods
- can be a way to build learning organizations and eventually deliver better programmes

This project is funded by the European Union

GFA Consulting Group   idom Consultoria

The Nordic+ Model of Cooperation

This project is funded by the European Union

GFA Consulting Group   idom Consultoria

If there is one final lesson...

FOR BETTER PROJECTS AND
PROGRAMMES,
FOCUS ON RESULTS

This project is
funded by
the European Union

but are we ready?

This project is
funded by
the European Union