



<b>Why yet another internal monitoring system?</b> <b>(REVIEW OF EXISTING MONITORING SYSTEM)</b> <b>HORIZONTAL ISSUES</b>		
	IDENTIFIED PROBLEMS	COMMENTS
1	<b>FRAGMENTATION OF THE MONITORING SYSTEM</b>	INTERNAL MONITORING SYSTEMS OF ALL KEY STAKEHOLDERS HAVE DEVELOPED MOSTLY IN AN INDEPENDENT MANNER AND REMAIN SEPARATE WITH <b><u>LITTLE COORDINATION</u></b>
2	<b>VARIETY OF INDIVIDUAL MONITORING APPROACHES</b>	THERE ARE DIFFERENT NEEDS, LEVELS OF PROJECT UNDERSTANDING AND PERSONAL COMFORT AND MONITORING BECOMES SUBJECT TO PERSONAL INTERPRETATION AND ADJUSTMENT BY TMs, POs and PMs, <b><u>NEED FOR HARMONISATION</u></b>
3	<b>LACK OF FOCUS ON PERFORMANCE, RESULTS AND OBJECTIVES IN MONITORING</b>	INPUT/ACTIVITY AND NARRATIVE CHARACTER OF THE CURRENT MONITORING DO NOT ALLOW FOR RATING OF PROJECT PERFORMANCE AND ASSESSMENT OF OVERALL PERFORMANCE ACCORDING TO ESTABLISHED M&E CRITERIA, <b><u>NEED FOR RESULTS FOCUS &amp; RATING</u></b>
4	<b>LACKING SYSTEM FOR SOUNDING ALARM BY FLAGGING PROBLEMATIC PROJECTS</b>	PROJECT ENVIRONMENT IS A DYNAMIC MEDIUM REQUIRING ATTENTION TO ALL ELEMENTS OF LOGICAL FRAMEWORK. PROJECT PERFORMANCE MAY CHANGE ON SHORT NOTICE

<b>REVIEW OF EXISTING MONITORING ...</b> <b>HORIZONTAL ISSUES</b>		
	IDENTIFIED PROBLEMS	COMMENTS
5	INSUFFICIENT PARTICIPATION / INVOLVEMENT OF KEY BENEFICIARIES IN MONITORING ACTIVITIES	GREATER INVOLVEMENT OF BENEFICIARIES AS PARTICIPANTS OF PROJECT MONITORING ACTIVITIES IS TO BE ENSURED TO <b><u>ENHANCE OWNERSHIP OF RESULTS AND SUSTAINABILITY</u></b> , AND PROVIDE FEEDBACK ON TRANSFORMATION OF OUTPUTS INTO RESULTS AND QUALITY OF RESULTS
6	INADEQUATE FEEDBACK TO IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS ON SUBMITTED REPORTS	DELIVERY OF REPORTS IS USUALLY A ONE WAY PROCESS WITH NO SYSTEMATIC FEEDBACK EXCEPT IN CASES OF FINANCIAL AND/OR ADMINISTRATIVE DEFICIENCIES. LACK OF MECHANISMS TO ENHANCE ACHIEVEMENT OF PROJECT RESULTS AND OBJECTIVES
7	ABSENCE OF A COMPREHENSIVE MONITORING INFORMATION DATA BASE FOR PROJECTS IMPLEMENTED IN ETHIOPIA EQUALLY ACCESSIBLE BY ECD AND ONAO	AS CRIS DATABASE IS EXCLUSIVELY FOR EC OFFICIALS ONLY, AND WITH DEVOLUTION OF PROJECTS AND INCREASING LOCAL PROJECT OWNERSHIP THERE IS A GROWING NEED FOR SHARING MONITORING INFORMATION, RATIONALE EMERGES FOR CREATION OF A COMMON MONITORING INFORMATION SYSTEM FOR BOTH EC DELEGATION AND ONAO, <b><u>NEED FOR SHARED DB</u></b>

<b>REVIEW OF EXISTING MONITORING ...</b> <b>EC DELEGATION</b>		
	IDENTIFIED PROBLEMS	COMMENTS
1	LACK OF COMPREHENSIVE SYSTEM FOR PLANNING OF MONITORING ACTIVITIES	MONITORING MISSIONS ARE APPLIED ON AD-HOC BASIS WITHOUT RATIONALE BASED ON EVIDENCE FOR PROBLEMATIC AND/OR STRATEGIC PROJECTS AND <b><u>INSUFFICIENT FORWARD PLANNING</u></b>
2	INSUFFICIENT COORDINATION OF MONITORING WITH NAO	THERE ARE VERY <b><u>FEW JOINT MONITORING MISSIONS</u></b> INVOLVING ECD AND NAO. ECD'S MONITORING & EVALUATION MANAGER DOES NOT HAVE A COUNTERPART
3	INSUFFICIENT UTILISATION OF GATHERED MONITORING INFORMATION FOR MANAGEMENT DECISIONS	INSUFFICIENT DIALOGUE BETWEEN RESPONSIBLES AT EC DELEGATION AND ONAO AT ALL LEVELS. <b><u>LACK OF MECHANISMS FOR AGGREGATION OF MONITORING DATA</u></b> FOR PORTFOLIO MANAGEMENT FOR TM/PO & UPPER MANAGEMENT
4	OVERWHELMING VOLUME OF NARRATIVE MONITORING INFORMATION	PROJECT FILES GROW BEYOND CAPACITY TO REVIEW AND ABSORB INFORMATION



## What is JROME?

- Variation of the external ROM
- **Results oriented, periodic & systematic** project performance measurement system focusing on **predefined criteria** which focus on results
- A tool allowing TMs to **assess project progress towards achievement of results** & take actions accordingly
- **Involves IPs** in data gathering and providing response/ feedback



## What is JROME?...

- Harmonizes individual internal monitoring approaches (also with ROM) and **allowing for aggregation of results** into programme/ project performance assessment;
- Has a **common DB/** knowledge base of learning and best practice in project implementation accessible to Govt, IPs and EC
- Inclusion of key elements of the assessment in regular project reporting

## Structuring of project portfolio

- **EDF component portfolio**
  - Managed by ECD & NAO
  - M&EMs based on input form TM/Pos
- **BL1**
  - Same as above
- **BL2**
  - Managed by ECD
  - M&EM with input from TM
- **Regional programs**
  - Same as above
- **BS/SPSP**
- **Portfolio regularly updated by TM/PO**  
(Pipeline, active, closed)
- **Periodic review by M&EM** in consultation with HOS

## JROM-E Monitoring

- **Frequency – Quarterly/max 6 monthly**
  - by IPs as internal monitoring tool/ self monitoring
  - by TMs/ portfolios managed by ECD
  - by ECD TMs jointly with NAO POs
- 1. **Review available documents**
  - FA, Progress Reports
  - LFM, Work plans/ activity schedule

(This will give a basis for assessment & interview during field visit and cross referencing the data with beneficiaries & other s/holders)



## JROM-E Monitoring...

### 2. Conduct actual monitoring

- 1<sup>st</sup> monitoring focuses more on relevance design and planning
- During implementation, more focus on efficiency & effectiveness
- Towards the end of the project, more on effectiveness, sustainability & impact

### **Sheets 1 & 2 TO 2 & 3 TO 3,4 & 5**

**However, conditions which needs to be fulfilled must be assessed**



## JROM-E Self Monitoring by IPs

- JROME is responsibility of TM/Pos
- Participation of IPs needs to be encouraged
  - To enhance their focus on results & objectives
  - To create common understanding with IROME/ROM monitors
  - To make them understand what is expected of the projects




## Review Meetings

- Basis for effective monitoring & communication system
- Tool for joint learning, consensus, communication & action building tool
- For projects under EDF, TMRM
- For NGO programs, QRMs
- Focus on strategic or problematic projects
  - used to discuss **project progress & other significant issues**
  - Should be based on TOR with clear agenda, structure, recorded output (decisions, recommendations & responsibilities)
- Annual “partners in implementation” conference

## IROME DATABASE

- Should be accessible to NAO, ECD & IPs
- Full search and reporting access to the comments in the **BCS**
- Statistical reporting tool for management reports, such as:
  - Analysis of scoring/observations/recommendations in relation to financing instrument/EDF Number;
  - Analysis of tendencies in scoring over the duration of a project;
  - Analysis of the link between the quality of log frame/design and quality of project results;
  - Analysis of the link between the quality of work planning and project results;
- New analytical products - fact sheets, interactive bulletins and monitoring/management solutions help desk



## Internal monitoring system & reporting obligations of the delegation

- Result Monitoring
  - Regular monitoring of CSP/NIP
  - Annual operational review
  - MT, EoT review
  - Policy dialogue
- Process Monitoring
  - AMP/ EAMR
  - Section work plans (section, HoS meetings..)
  - IROME (report review, field visit, QRM, CRIS...)
  - Portfolio management



## Benefits

- Very useful for TMs;
- Improves NGOs reporting
- Coherence with external ROM
- Useful for reporting to HQ
- clearly indicates level of achievement, drawbacks and whether program is on track
- Links monitoring & management with LF
- Seeks mechanism of efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability from the beginning
- Makes monitoring participatory & facilitates information exchange & collaboration among partners through RS

## Benefits...

- Complements/ validates reports submitted by partners
- Focuses on solutions timely
- Can replace CRIS implementation window
- Links monitoring & standard evaluation criteria
- Facilitates information sharing
- The DB helps to monitor & manage portfolio
- Harmonized with other monitoring tools of the commission

## Challenges

- IT related problems, inaccessibility of the system
- Doesn't accommodate joint programs, sector support (some programs are funded by multiple donors & cover more than 1/3 of the Country)
- Redundant if not replacing CRIS implementation monitoring window





## Challenges...

- IT not much user friendly
- Need to be customized to accommodate joint programs, sector and budget support
- Lacks reporting on methodology, like activities visited, partners & target groups interviewed/ involved
- Preparing JROME report based on partners report might be considered as duplication of effort



## Challenges...

- Need clear definition on terms like contracts, projects & programs in terms of M&E and portfolio management
- Providing overview for management staff (HoS, HoO, HoD)
- Link with other aid management systems managed by GoE (Aid Management Platform)
- Important to organize quarterly joint review meetings with all TMs