



M&E

MONITORING
AND EVALUATION
SYSTEMS

SUMMARY DOCUMENT



TRANSFORM is the result of an iterative process of co-creation involving experts and practitioners from southern and eastern Africa. This manual is based on a document prepared by Andrew Kardan, Valentina Barca, and Andrew Wyatt (Oxford Policy Management) with contributions from Franck Earl (SASSA), Luis Frota, and Thea Westphal (ILO). The revised content on gender-responsive and disability-inclusive administration of social protection was prepared by Tia Palermo, Maja Gavrilovic, Morgon Banks, and Lusajo Kajula from Policy Research Solutions (PRESTO) LLC and reviewed by the TRANSFORM Advisory Group.

The editors of the TRANSFORM curriculum series are Luca Pellerano, Luis Frota, and Nuno Cunha. Participants to workshops in Kenya, Zambia, and Tanzania provided useful comments and inputs. The content of this manual does not reflect the official position of the different organizations supporting the TRANSFORM initiative.

TRANSFORM is a public good. All TRANSFORM materials including this manual are licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International Licence.

You are free to:

Share – copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format

Adapt – remix, transform, and build upon the material

Under the following terms:

Attribution – You must give appropriate credit, provide a link to the license, and indicate if changes were made.

NonCommercial – You may not use the material for commercial purposes unless expressly authorized by the licensor.

ShareAlike – If you remix, transform, or build upon the material, you must distribute your contributions under the same license as the original.

To view a copy of this licence visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>

For further information, you can contact the TRANSFORM initiative at

transform_socialprotection@ilo.org or visit www.transformsp.org

Transform, (2023) "Governance of Social Protection Systems: Institutions, Organizational Structure and Capacity - Manual for a Leadership and Transformation Curriculum On Building and Managing Social Protection Floors in Africa", (Original publication date: 2017; Updated: 2023) available at TRANSFORM | Building Social Protection Floors in Africa www.transformsp.org

Suggested Citation: Transform, (2023) "Governance of Social Protection Systems: Institutions, Organizational Structure and Capacity - Manual for a Leadership and Transformation Curriculum On Building and Managing Social Protection Floors in Africa", (Original publication date: 2017; Updated: 2023) available at TRANSFORM | Building Social Protection Floors in Africa (www.transformsp.org)

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AIDS	Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome
CCTs	Automated Teller Machine
CESCR	Conditional Cash Transfer
CFPR	Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights
ECOSOC	Challenging the Frontiers of Poverty Reduction
HIV	United Nations Economic and Social Council
HSNP	Human Immunodeficiency Virus
ID	Hunger Safety Net Programme
M&E	Identity
MIS	Monitoring and Evaluation
NGO	Management Information System
POS	Non-Governmental Organization
R. 202	ILO Social Protection Floors Recommendation, 2012 (No. 202)
SASSA	South African Social Security Agency
SP	Social Protection
SMS	Short Message Service

CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	II	2.4.4 Spot checks or independent monitoring checks	20
CONTENTS	III	2.4.5 Impact evaluation	20
1 MONITORING AND EVALUATION (M&E) SYSTEMS	1	2.6 Defining institutional arrangements	24
1.1 Why M&E is important for effective social protection programming	1	2.7 Take-away lessons	25
1.2 Political economy of monitoring and evaluation	4	3 ENSURING DEMAND FOR M&E DATA	26
1.2.1 M&E and the policy making process	4	3.1 Enhancing demand for M&E	26
1.3 M&E evidence: supply and demand	5	3.2 Enhancing the uptake of evidence	30
1.3.1 Understanding information needs	8	3.3 Experiential learning and the learning organisation	31
1.4 Take-away lessons	10	3.3.1 Learning through experience	31
2 ENSURING SUPPLY OF M&E DATA	11	3.4 Take-away lessons	33
2.1 Developing a theory of change	11		
2.2 Defining the indicators	14		
2.3 Prioritising, refining and organising	15		
2.4 Defining monitoring and evaluation approaches	17		
2.4.1 Untangle the differences between monitoring and evaluation	17		
2.4.2 Choosing the right evaluation approach	18		
2.4.3 Participatory monitoring approaches	19		

MONITORING AND EVALUATION (M&E) SYSTEMS

1.1. WHY M&E IS IMPORTANT FOR EFFECTIVE SOCIAL PROTECTION PROGRAMMING

The ILO's Recommendation 202 recommends that countries should regularly 'collect, compile, analyze and publish an appropriate range of data statistics and indicators¹'. This is critical to safeguarding compliance with existing legislation, ensuring transparency and accountability and building a basis for the continuous improvement of social protection systems, to meet the specific needs of and the equitable inclusion of vulnerable groups, including women and girls, and people with disability.

A good M&E system promotes a continuous learning cycle, fosters transformation in social protection, and improves service delivery. Ideally, it is triggered by a continuous demand for M&E and gives equal importance to monitoring and evaluation functions (see Box 1 below). Moreover, an M&E framework that harmonizes indicators from across social protection programmes can help to overcome potential fragmentation at the policy and programme level, while reaping benefits in terms of cost and capacity synergies.



Editorial Note

Please note that a comprehensive version of this document with clickable links is available on the Transform Project website, visit www.transformsp.org to access the file

¹ ILO, 2012, Recommendation 202, Section II

Specifically, a well-functioning M&E system in the social protection sector can²:

1. improve policy/programme management and planning ('inwards facing' M&E)

- Improve policy/programme design: in order to learn about the efficiency and effectiveness of a policy/program so to inform decisions on whether to extend, improve, or eliminate it. The ultimate aim would be to better serve the poor and vulnerable and more equitably and efficiently provide services.
- Help solve problems in policy/programme implementation: monitoring execution to detect and correct implementation problems and facilitate evidence-based fine-tuning of the operational design.
- Help prioritize, plan and budget: helping relevant authorities and managers to coordinate and prioritize activities and undertake planning and budget allocation decisions.

2. enhance policy/programme accountability ('outwards facing' M&E)

- Ensure accountability within the government: monitoring of policy/programme execution to ensure that agents are doing what they have undertaken to do.
- Provide public information for external accountability: providing information to elected officials and the general public to (i) legitimize the policy/program through the provision of results and achievements; (ii) encourage public choice and voice.
- Track outcomes using an equity lens, disaggregating data by age, gender, disability status, ethnicity, and other known vulnerabilities to ensure the programme is equitably reaching all beneficiaries and leading to positive impacts.

Box 1: Untangling Monitoring and Evaluation

When discussing M&E systems for Social Protection, the standard approach is to lump the two concepts of monitoring and evaluation together, without necessarily distinguishing between the very different objectives these two activities help to achieve.

According to the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD, 2002) and to the commonly accepted DAC terminology, monitoring can be defined as a "continuous function that uses the systematic collection of data on specified indicators to provide management and the main stakeholders of an on-going development intervention with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of objectives, and progress in the use of allocated funds".

Evaluation, on the other hand, is defined as the "systematic and objective assessment of an on-going or completed activity, program or policy, its design, implementation and results. The aim is to determine the relevance and fulfilment of objectives, development efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability"

- Monitoring focuses primarily on the relationship between inputs and outputs, with a view at "improving" the efficiency of the implementation.
- Evaluation focusses primarily on the relationship between outputs and impacts, with a view at "proving" the effectiveness of the design.



² Reorganised by Attah et al (2014) – "How to Move beyond the Impact Evaluation Trap? Setting up Comprehensive M&E Systems for Social Protection Programmes" available here – based on a classification by Shepherd (2011).



M&E data is not of use in itself, unless it is translated into information, knowledge and ultimately shapes decisions. Developing an M&E system is about building capacity and practice to gather information from the past course of action, learn from past experience, and use data in way to orient and improve course of action in the future.

The role of M&E is to provide reliable information to enable the decision makers “do the right things” as well as to “do things right”. An M&E system should therefore provide information that allows it to:


- to improve control and efficiency of social protection systems (relating primarily to the “internal” objectives of M&E mentioned above);
- to prove value and effectiveness (relating primarily to the “external” objectives of M&E mentioned above);
- **Avoid bias and track progress on inclusive and context-specific indicators for vulnerable groups; as well as**
- **Detect unintended effects** of programmes on beneficiaries and identify gaps and weaknesses in programme delivery to modify design and/or implementation practices to avoid harmful outcomes and improve results

1.2 POLITICAL ECONOMY OF MONITORING AND EVALUATION

1.2.1 M&E and the Policy Making Process

The growing focus on “evidence based policy making” reflects the increasingly central role of credible data and analysis at all steps of the policy making progress. Monitoring and evaluation instruments can play different roles at different stages of the policy design and implementation process (see Figure 2).

Figure 2: Evidence and the Policy Making Process



Source: Urban Institute, <http://urbn.is/2gQc3hU>



Yet, the core business of policy makers is to make decisions whether the credible evidence is available or not. The learning process is shaped by evidence as much as it is shaped by theoretical assumptions and suppositions, as well as previous experience (refer to steps T and E in Figure 1). Moreover, the evidence provided by M&E systems is in direct competition with layman's opinions, gossip, hearsay and anecdotes, long held prejudices and beliefs. Even in the presence of unbiased high quality M&E information, decisions can be made based on prior opinions, perceptions and experience, in addition to, or even disregarding the evidence available.

Decision making is a complex process which brings together a constellation of a number of variables including political considerations. Decisions are not made in a linear manner and usually are a product of a number of interests, influences, ideas and agendas working in isolation or in tandem. To a large extent the success or failure of an M&E system depends on the interplay between evidence and such other factors in shaping the policy making and policy implementation process.

1.3 M&E EVIDENCE: SUPPLY AND DEMAND³

In order to achieve the objectives outlined above, M&E systems must be designed in such a way so as to strike a balance between the supply (the capacity needed to produce quality evidence in a timely fashion, and the cost of doing so), and the demand for evidence of particular kinds needed by multiple users for decision making. We discuss how this can be ensured in the remainder of this document..


The supply of good information must be matched by effective demand and use of evidence. These two "forces" mutually enforce one another, resulting in better design of M&E systems for social protection. Data users must know what evidence they need and why, whilst the data providers must know how to generate and disseminate quality information. Supply and demand of M&E information must work in sync to avoid a mismatch. M&E information must be provided in an equitable manner and not discriminate against stakeholder based on their gender, age, disability status and other vulnerabilities. This includes making results available and disseminating them in simple, user-friendly formats, and accessible formats such as Braille, audio and video with sign language.

In order to achieve the objectives outlined above, M&E systems must be designed in such a way so as to strike a balance between the supply (the capacity needed to produce quality evidence in a timely fashion, and the cost of doing so), and the demand for evidence of particular kinds needed by multiple users for decision making. We discuss how this can be ensured below.

3 This section draws largely from Attah et al (2015) and Segone (2008)



Figure 1: Demand and supply of M&E data for non-social protection



Source: Attah et al (2015)

If evidence that is technically sound is not policy relevant, then it will not be used by policy-makers. The opposite also applies, that is, policy-makers may be forced to use poor quality evidence, if this is the only evidence available that address their policy questions. Getting the right balance between both the principles of professional autonomy and accountability, and the relevance of evidence produced, is paramount. (Segone, 2008).


The following key factors are critical to ensure an effective balance between demand and supply of M&E. They are further discussed in Section 3.

- **Improve the dialogue between policymakers and evidence providers.** To maintain and sustain this balance, deliberate efforts must be made to ensure that there is constant dialogue between the data providers and data users. This is strategic because, at the end of the day, policy-makers know what evidence they need, why they need it, and when they need it. Statisticians, evaluators and researchers know how to provide that evidence. (Segone, 2008)



- **Making evidence “usable” for the policy-making community.** Getting the policy makers to own the evidence needed for effective implementation of policies is critical. Evidence should not be the property of the data gatherers. The evidence supplied must be reliable, trustworthy, disaggregated to represent the situation of vulnerable groups, well disseminated in user-friendly and accessible formats with wide access for various users and interest groups. A key issue is how to communicate findings to those who need to know.
- **Building and supporting the national and local capacity to gather and analyse data.** This promotes local and national ownership of the evidence and enhances political buy in from policymakers. The source of data matters to policymakers.
- **Provide incentives to use evidence.** A key ingredient of ensuring that policy makers are using the evidence is to create an incentive structure that will increase uptake of evidence. This comprise different strategies (see more on carrots, sticks and sermons in section 3), all hinging around the notion of promoting good performance based on demonstrable (evidence based) results. Partnerships with civil society representatives of different stakeholder groups may increase the quality of the data collected and the likelihood of evidence being used by decision-makers, as civil society organisations can share the evidence through their networks and are often effective at lobbying for change. They may also act as gatekeepers to ensuring that the rights of vulnerable groups – such as women and girls and people with disability – are included.

Figure 2: Increasing use of evidence by balancing demand and supply



Source: Segone (2008)

Many governments and organizations are moving from “opinion based policy” towards “evidence-based policy”, and are in the stage of “evidence-influenced policy”. This is mainly due to the nature of the policy environment as well as national technical capacity to provide good quality and trustworthy evidence.

1.3.1 Understanding information needs

Critical to the successful uptake of evidence generated through M&E is to assess the stakeholders various interests, specific information needs and the influence that they wield and incentives at play.

Three major categories of stakeholders can be distinguished in relation to social protection systems⁴:

- the **national authorities** with its various components (the executive, the legislative, the control and oversight bodies), both at national and at decentralized government levels. These different national stakeholders may have discordant interests and cannot be considered as one homogeneous group;
- national **civil society** (which also is not a homogeneous group either, it comprises NGOs, churches, research institutes, women’s groups, Organisations of Persons with Disabilities, programme beneficiaries, as well as the wider public, etc.). They need to have access to programme-related information and evidence, as they can act as a key source of support for social protection policies and their equitable expansion.;
- the **international community** (donors and cooperating partners), where relevant. This is also a diverse group and interests do not always converge.

In terms of M&E accountability and learning each of these groups has its own interests (see table 1 below).



Table 1: Key stakeholders - standard information needs

LEVEL	STAKEHOLDERS	INFORMATION NEEDS
Central	Members of Parliament	Mainly interested in information on their own constituency. Want to know about impact and scale-up plans.
	Ministry of Finance	Interested mostly in budget and efficiency/effectiveness of programme, as well as impact
	Other Ministries	Interested in resource allocation and impact (especially when related to their core area); some interest in coordinating operations
	Donors	Strong focus on impact, sustainability, Value for Money, efficiency and effectiveness of operations and overall accountability
	Media	Want to know what is happening when; often information misused for sensational reporting
	Planning Unit within the lead Ministry	Mostly interested in information for planning and budgeting purposes (number of recipients, total amounts disbursed, etc.) as well as ad-hoc responses to parliamentary queries.
	Management Unit within lead Ministry	Focus on all information above + indicators useful for programme management (cost-efficiency and effectiveness, compliance with Service Standards, etc.)
Province/district	Provincial/district authority	Interested in impact and overall number and types of beneficiaries at province/ district level; information for coordination and management of lower levels: staff, budget and Quality Control;
Community	Community level leaders, social workers; Civil Society Organisations	Interested in number and identity of beneficiaries in their area and any other information to hold program accountable (e.g. citizen perceptions of programme). Civil society organisations may be issue-specific, for example, those who focus on rights of people with disability or women and girls.
	Beneficiaries	Beneficiaries often include vulnerable groups such as women, girls, and people with disability. They need to know the transfer value and periodicity.

Source: Authors

The following questions are critical in assessing the relevance of M&E for different stakeholders:

- What decisions, if any, is evidence from the M&E system expected to inform? What would stakeholders do differently because of the evidence provided by the M&E system?
- When would decisions be made? When must M&E information be available to be timely and influential?
- What information is needed as a priority to inform decisions?
- Who will use the evidence from the M&E system, that is, who has the willingness, authority and/or ability to put learning from the M&E system to use?
- Can data be disaggregated by all relevant beneficiary groups to allow for monitoring of equity and equality?
- How will the outcomes for different beneficiary groups – including those who are marginalized and vulnerable – be collected, reported and disseminated?



1.4 TAKE-AWAY LESSONS

- Recommendation 202 suggests that countries should regularly 'collect, compile, analyze and publish an appropriate range of data statistics and indicators'.
- Decision making is a complex process involving different variables including political interests and this process does not happen in a linear manner. As the capacity to generate and use quality evidence increases, many governments are moving from opinion based policy making to evidence based policy making.
- Good M&E is critical to monitoring compliance with existing legislation, ensuring transparency and accountability (both internal and external) and building a basis for the continuous improvement of social protection systems (improve policy/program design; solve problems in policy/program implementation; help prioritize, plan and budget).
- M&E systems perform two very different functions: they provide evidence for both proving that the programme is "doing the right things", and for improving so to ensure the programme is "doing things right". Both functions should be given adequate importance.
- In order to achieve its objectives, M&E systems must be designed in such a way so as to strike a balance

ENSURING SUPPLY OF M&E DATA⁵

Indicators, M&E approaches, data sources and institutional arrangements, discussed in depth below, are the main building blocks of an M&E framework – helping to evaluate programs against their Theory of Change and related Results Framework.

2.1 DEVELOPING A THEORY OF CHANGE

The **Logical Framework Approach** is an analytical process and set of tools used to support project planning and management. According to the World Bank (2000), “the Logical Framework has the power to communicate the essential elements of a complex project clearly and succinctly throughout the project cycle. It is used to develop the overall design of a project, to improve the project implementation monitoring and to strengthen periodic project evaluation”. It provides a set of interlocking concepts which are used as part of an iterative process to aid structured and systematic analysis of a project or programme idea, or its **Theory of Change**.



Standard practice, as articulated in project planning or logical framework approaches, describes a ‘development project’ as inputs (financial and other resources), which are translated by an implementing agency into specified activities to produce useful outputs. These outputs have the goal of outcomes and impacts of higher well-being for the intended beneficiaries (Pritchett, 2013). See Figure 6 below for a schematic representation of the logical **framework structure**.

Inputs, activities and outputs are under the control of the programme managers, as their relationship depends on the implementation model, capacity and organisation. Outcomes and impacts are outside the control of the programme managers, as they depend on contextual factors and the behavioral response of intended beneficiaries (and other actors) to the intervention. A robust Theory of Change should be a primary tool for guiding the M&E of interventions (e.g., policies, single and integrated programmes) and assessing changes (positive and unintended) and pathways through which these changes occur and manifest themselves.

⁵ This section draws largely from Attah et al. (2015)

M&E

Figure 6: Logical Framework and the role of M&E



Source: Prittchet (2013)

A representation of a stylized theory of change for a social protection programme is provided in Figure 7 and a concrete example of a logframe, with a definition of inputs, outputs outcomes and impacts for a cash transfer intervention in Ghana is discussed in Box 4. Best practice in developing a Theory of Change is to use a participatory approach with key stakeholders, including representatives from vulnerable groups, to ensure important inputs and outcomes are not omitted from M&E data. Barriers to participation should be considered within a Theory of Change and outcome measures such as programme coverage should be disaggregated by gender and disability status. Similarly, indicators of programme impact should be disaggregated by gender and disability status, and additional disability-specific indicators may be needed to capture areas of concern for people with disability and their households. Similarly, all social protection programmes – event those without explicit gender objectives – are likely to produce gender-specific outcomes. These prospective gender changes should be properly reflected in programme’s ToC. , either by specifying gender aspects in the existing ToC diagrams and narrative or by reconstructing a specific gender-sensitive ToC from the existing logical frame or programme theory. Involving people with disability and women in the design of a ToC and the development of M&E indicators can help to (i) identify a more meaningful and accurate vision of change for these groups resulting from an intervention and (ii) map opportunities and challenges to achieving the programme’s desired outcomes amongst these groups, as well as appropriate indicators for M&E.



Box 4: Ghana LEAP results framework from inputs to impacts

The Livelihood Empowerment Against Poverty (LEAP) programme is the flagship programme of Ghana’s National Social Protection Strategy (NSPS) that began in 2008. The programme was designed to fight poverty among extremely vulnerable populations by providing bimonthly cash payments to extremely poor households with orphans and vulnerable children, the elderly with no productive capacity, and people with severe disabilities with impaired ability to work. The specific objectives of LEAP are:

To improve basic household consumption and nutrition among children below two years of age, the aged (65 years and above without productive capacity) and people with a severe disability;


To increase access to health care services among children below five years of age, the aged (65 years and above without productive capacity) and people with a severe disability;

To increase basic school enrolment, attendance and retention of recipient children between five and 15 years of age; and

To facilitate access to complementary services among recipient households.

Figure 8 below captures the different stages of the implementation process from inputs to impact. It identifies the key stages involved for LEAP to reach its objective of reduction in extreme poverty. This results framework is the outcome of a series of discussions held with the LEAP management team and forms the starting point for the development of the M&E system.

Figure 8: Results framework for the Ghana LEAP programme



Box 5: Engendering Ghana's 'LEAP 1000' evaluation framework

In 2015, the Government of Ghana introduced a pilot called 'LEAP 1000' to include a new category of recipients: pregnant women and children under the age of 12 months, among households who meet the poverty-related criteria. LEAP 1000 provides bimonthly cash transfers and premium waivers to enroll in the National Health Insurance Scheme (NHIS). In recognition of the fact that poverty is gendered and sustainable poverty reduction cannot be achieved without addressing gender inequalities, the impact evaluation of LEAP 1000 included an examination of **gender-sensitive outcomes. LEAP 1000 was found to have the following effects related to gender equality and more positive outcomes for women:** increased savings, greater agency and decision-making, increased happiness and life satisfaction, greater social support, and reduced intimate partner violence. LEAP 1000 was first piloted in 10 districts in northern Ghana and has since been scaled up into the LEAP programme nationwide.

Source: Authors and Ghana LEAP 1000 Evaluation Team. (2018). *Ghana LEAP 1000 Programme: Endline Evaluation Report*. UNICEF Office of Research 2018 Florence, Italy.

Box 6: Monitoring disability assessments in South Africa

Disability assessments are required for determining eligibility in most disability-targeted programmes. However, these assessments can be complex and assessors often have insufficient guidance and training to conduct them properly. Consequently, there are complaints that disability assessments in many settings are inconsistent and can exclude some people with disability (e.g. people with less apparent impairments).

To address these concerns, South Africa has implemented some monitoring mechanisms for their disability assessments. About 20% of disability assessments, which are required for applications for the Disability Grant, are reviewed by a panel of medical experts. These experts check for agreement between their assessments and those reached by the Medical Officers within the South Africa Social Security Agency (SASSA). The expert panel's assessments do not change the decisions of SASSA, but are used to monitor trends in decision-making amongst Medical Officers and ensure they are implementing assessments according to protocol. This form of monitoring can help to ensure the established protocol is being accurately followed so that assessment decisions are less subjective. However, it is unlikely to capture challenges within the official assessment protocols that can create barriers to access for some people with disability (e.g., assessment criteria is biased against certain types of impairments; financial, attitudinal and other barriers affecting access).

Source: Kidd et. al 2019, Kidd et al. 2018

2.2 DEFINING THE INDICATORS

Each country should develop their indicators based on country/policy/program specific information needs:

- **The policy/program objectives,** Theory of Change, Logical Framework (see previous Section) and specific Service Standards (see Section 4). For example, what information do I need to assess whether Input, Activity, Output or Outcome X in the Results Framework has been achieved and to what extent? What indicators enable me to measure whether I am performing in terms of my Service Standard targets?
- **The needs of different actors and stakeholders.** For example, what does Actor X want to know about the policy/program and for what purpose? What information does Actor X need to adequately fulfil his/her duties in relation to the policy/ programme? (See also Table 1 above)
- **The functioning of key policy/program processes.** For example, what are the main steps involved in Process X (e.g. registration and enrolment)? Are these steps implemented as intended, and why? What information is needed to monitor each of those steps?



While different countries develop very different systems, Grosh et al (2008) advise that a comprehensive M&E System will track indicators capturing inputs, processes, outputs, intermediate and final outputs, and performance of its programmes. In detail:

- **Inputs:** budget, staff time and other administrative resources (though very difficult to quantify and operational costs are often not broken down by the type of activities staff engage in). Accessibility audits of programme facilities, procedures and systems are also required.
- **Output:** number of beneficiaries, typology and profile of beneficiaries, number of transfers and other services provided to them.
- **Outcome/Impact:** Indicators to measure improvement in beneficiaries' consumption, incomes, wages, accessibility, empowerment, social support, etc (depending on programme Theory of Change) and satisfaction with the programme. Programmes may also assess the moderating factors which influence the nature, scale and magnitude of outcome/impacts. Note that these are difficult to collect for standard monitoring activities and pertain mostly to the realm of evaluation. Nevertheless, some form of outcome monitoring is possible (e.g. using data from national surveys).
- **Performance or efficiency indicators,** so as to capture the programme's cost-effectiveness. These indicators do not just focus on what was inputted or on outputs alone, but compare inputs and outputs to the goals that need to be achieved (e.g., keep costs under a certain amount, percentage of women and girls and people with disability accessing programme in comparison to the general population). Performance indicators are therefore tied to goals and objectives and serve simply as 'yardsticks' by which to measure the degree of success in goal achievement. Performance indicators are usually expressed as a rate, ratio or percentage.

2.3 PRIORITISING, REFINING AND ORGANISING

Indicators should also be prioritised, refined and organised as an iterative process (an extensive mapping of information needs can lead to a number of indicators that is extremely large and unmanageable). This includes:

- **prioritising indicators** based on a realistic assessment of their feasibility and usefulness (e.g. during participatory workshops with all key stakeholders, including organisations representing vulnerable groups, such as Organisations of People with Disabilities, women's groups, youth, etc.);
- **refining each indicator** to make sure it fulfils the 'CREAM' and 'SMART' criteria (see more in Box 7) and can be effectively calculated. This involves mapping each indicator back to its constituting formula (numerator and denominator) and potential data source, as well as defining how often that indicator will be collected and by whom. At a minimum, indicators should be disaggregated by sex/gender, disability status and age. Other variables relevant to the programme (e.g., ethnicity, marital status, etc.) should also be captured where possible. The number of indicators should be manageable and should not overburden the staff responsible for data collection, as this may lead to institutional resistance and poor quality of data. For example, see Table 3 below.
- **organising indicators** based on their use. For example, distinguishing between those focusing on programme operations ('management' or 'operational' indicators, that could be used by managers at all levels to assess the overall functioning of the policy/programme), and those focusing on results ('analysis' or 'results' indicators, used by high level managers to measure progress against outcomes and for external accountability). Within each of these, indicators can then be organised by process and by Log frame level (input, output, etc.). See more in Figure 6 above.

Box 8: SMART and CREAM indicators

CREAM and SMART principles are used to select good performance indicators. SMART and CREAM describe desirable properties of M&E indicators. Defining indicators that are CREAM and SMART amounts to an insurance policy, because the more precise and coherent the indicators, the better focused the measurement strategies will be.

SMART		
S	SPECIFIC	An indicator measures only the design element (output, outcome or impact) that it is intended to measure and none of the other elements in the design
M	MEASURABLE	Has the capacity to be counted, observed, analyzed, tested, or challenged
A	ATTAINABLE/ ACHIEVABLE	The indicator is achievable if the performance target accurately specifies the amount or level of what is to be measured to meet the result/outcome.
R	RELEVANT	An indicator must be relevant. It should be a valid measure of the result/outcome and be linked through research and professional expertise. There is no reason to create an indicator which does not relate to the larger outcome
T	TIMEBOUND	The indicator is attached to a time frame. The indicator should state when it will be measured.
CREAM		
C	CLEAR	Precise and unambiguous
R	RELEVANT	Appropriated to the subject matter at hand
E	ECONOMIC	Available at a reasonable cost
A	ADEQUATE	Able to provide a sufficient basis to assess the performance
M	MONITORABLE	Amenable to independent validation

Source: Kusek and Rist (2004)



2.4 DEFINING MONITORING AND EVALUATION APPROACHES

There are a wide range of monitoring and evaluation approaches that can be adopted to different circumstances, at different stages of the policy implementation cycle, depending on the information needs amongst different external and internal stakeholders and the critical issues for decision.

2.4.1 Untangle the differences between Monitoring and Evaluation

When discussing M&E systems for Social Protection, the standard approach is to lump the two concepts of monitoring and evaluation together, without necessarily distinguishing between the very different objectives these two activities help to achieve. Table 4 below summarizes the complementarities between monitoring and evaluation approaches.

- **Monitoring** is a regular collection and analysis of programme data to track the progress of an intervention and determine whether it is on track or not. Monitoring is necessary for efficient administration and decision-making, for improving quality of service provision, and for the dissemination of information to bolster institutional learning and accountability.
- **Evaluation** is a periodic assessment of a programme to establish whether it is achieving the intended goals and objectives and how. Evaluation is necessary to increase in-depth knowledge about one or several aspects of the intervention for learning, informing decision-making processes, and enhancing legitimacy. Sometimes the term evaluation refers to assessing changes in outcomes resulting from an intervention. This is only one type of evaluation: impact evaluation (more in Section 2.4.5).

Table 4: Monitoring and Evaluation for Social Protection compared

	MONITORING	EVALUATION
Focus	Understanding and fixing programme failures and assessing functioning of key programme processes, for better programme management (note that this can include outcome monitoring)	Determining the relevance and fulfilment of objectives, development efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of a social protection policy or program
Utility	Aims at continuous program improvement and accountability	Provides information for major decisions such as starting, ceasing, expanding, or reducing a program
Frequency	A continuous, routine activity that should be an integral component of any programme	Infrequent undertaking (done at certain key moments in time), if impact evaluation baseline is before program starts
Breadth	Comprehensive – aimed at all aspects of programme implementation	Less comprehensive – aimed at specific aspects of a programme theory of change or implementation
Cost	Involves low annual costs, however set up costs can be large	Cost varies largely depending on the evaluation methodology that is used

Source: adapted by Attah et al (2014) from Burt and Hatry (2005) and Grosh et al (2008)



2.4.2 Choosing the right evaluation approach⁶

Evaluation approaches can differ largely in terms of the evaluation questions addressed (see Box 9 below) and the methodological approaches adopted. In broad strokes there are two main families of evaluations:

- **Evaluation for formative purposes**, to inform decisions about programme or policy improvement. Formative evaluation is considered useful at two levels:
 - **Programme Level:** in order to improve the efficiency or effectiveness of specific programme delivery mechanisms (eg grievance mechanism), the appropriateness of the service delivered (eg. size of the cash transfer or the nature of farming inputs, accessibility for different populations) or intergration/mainstreaming of cross-cutting issues (e.g. integration of nutrition, gender or disability in a programme);
 - **Policy Level:** in order to improve the functioning of the social protection system (e.g. horizontal or vertical coordination), strategy/policy or implementation plan.
- **Evaluation for summative purposes**, assessing the merit and worth of a programme or a strategy, in order to inform decisions about expanding, downscaling, merging, phasing out or redesigning it.

Table 5 below discusses how different types of evaluation could be relevant and appropriate in different circumstances.

Table 5: Alternative Evaluation Approaches

EVALUATION TYPES	WHEN TO USE	WHAT IT SHOWS	WHY IT IS USEFUL
Formative Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During the development of a new program • When modifying an existing program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether the proposed program elements • will be understood and accepted by the pop • Extent to which an evaluation is possible based on the goals and objectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allows modification to the plan before implementation • Maximises likelihood of success of program
Process Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As soon as program implementation begins • During an operation of an existing programme 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How well the program is working • The extent to which the program is being implemented as designed • Factors which moderate delivery of programme 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides an early warning for any problems that may occur • Provides insight on implementation processes and how they can be improved • Provides insight if programme failures are the result of design flaws or delivery gaps

⁶ This section draws largely from Pellens (2017)



Table 5: Continued

EVALUATION TYPES	WHEN TO USE	WHAT IT SHOWS	WHY IT IS USEFUL
Economic Evaluation: Cost Analysis Cost Benefit Analysis Cost Unit Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At the beginning of program (ex-ante) During operation of program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What resources are being used and their costs(direct and indirect) compared to the outcomes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides ex-ante considerations as to whether the intervention is worth undertaking Provides managers a way to assess the costs relative to the results and improve performances
Impact Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> During the operation of a program at appropriate intervals At the end of the program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The degree to which the program meets its ultimate goal e.g. reduction of food insecurity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides evidence on “what works” in a specific context. Proves the goodness of a concept/design.
Systematic Reviews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> When evidence about a given intervention is available from impact evaluation studies across a wide range of contexts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gives a conclusions on a research question that was contested by summarizing evidence from all available studies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides evidence on “what works” across a variety of contexts. Allows to compare results across countries in a systematic way

Source: adapted from Boaz et al. (2002)

2.4.3 Participatory monitoring approaches

Several approaches have been used to enhance civic engagement and incorporate the views of programme beneficiaries into programme monitoring and design, promoting transparency and accountability. For example, in South Africa, the Department of Performance, Monitoring and Evaluation in the Presidency (DPME) has initiated a ‘Framework for Strengthening Citizen- Government Partnerships for Monitoring Frontline Service Delivery’, involving a Citizen-Based Monitoring (CBM) Pilot. ‘This Government initiated accountability mechanism represents an effort to include citizens’ experience of service delivery into their overall monitoring, evaluation and performance frameworks.’ The most common tools to carry out participatory monitoring include:

- Citizen Report Cards and Beneficiary Satisfaction Surveys:** participatory surveys that provide quantitative feedback on user perceptions of the quality, adequacy and efficiency of public services. They go beyond just being a data collection exercise to being an instrument to exact public accountability through the extensive media coverage and civil society advocacy that accompanies the process. To ensure a truly participatory and inclusive process, it is important that vulnerable groups, such as people with disability, women and girls, are not only included in the data collection, but also consulted in the development of the surveys. Consultations need to ensure that the questions asked on the surveys are relevant and accessible to these groups.



- **Community Score Cards:** qualitative monitoring tools that are used for local level monitoring and performance evaluation of services. These methods are particularly important for groups that face barriers to participating in research, such as literacy and physical impairments. To increase participation, relevance and empowerment, vulnerable groups such as people with disability, women and girls, need to be trained on how to use tools like Community Score Cards and also participate in data collection. These processes also need to be accessible for and inclusive of people with different types of disability. By including an interface meeting between service providers and the community that allows for immediate feedback, the process is also a strong instrument for empowerment.

2.4.4 Spot checks or independent monitoring checks⁷

Independent monitoring checks (IMCs) are a way to randomly verify the data generated at the decentralized level on social protection implementation (e.g. district payment forms, case management, and district quarterly forms). IMCs provide a structured methodology to ensure that programme operational procedures are being followed in the field. The data from the IMCs can also be used to supplement and triangulate other data. The IMC instruments are specifically designed to check field compliance and programme procedures at the institutional and household level. These instruments provide controls and follow-up actions for all programme processes.

The IMC instruments are in the form of a series of yes/no questions that are easy and fast to administer (approximately 10-15 minutes at the most) and easy to enter into a database for analysis. These checks cover a range of themes, such as payment, perception of services, registration, programme understanding, enrolment, complaint procedure etc. Different

IMC instruments can address different programme stakeholders, for example, community members member, district welfare officers, community and civil society organisations, and service providers.

2.4.5 Impact Evaluation

Impact evaluation aims at assessing the changes that can be attributed to a particular intervention. The objective of an impact evaluation is to ascertain the extent to which a given intervention contributes to a change in the behaviour and state of its beneficiaries (impact and outcome level), or in other words to impact evaluation is to estimate the **causal effect** of the intervention on a given outcome variable.

The term causal effect is key to understanding the key focus of an impact evaluation. Causal effect means that some change has happened, and **such change can be attributed to a specific intervention**, and not to any other factor, initiative or characteristic of the context. The whole purpose of an impact evaluation is to isolate change that is due to the intervention from change that may be due to other "confounders".

- Assessing the impact of an intervention by comparing what happened to the beneficiaries (the traditional before-after analysis) can be very misleading as the change observed may not be due to the intervention but to other factors.
- The question an impact evaluation aims to answer is not "what happened with the beneficiaries" but rather "what would have happened if the beneficiaries had not participated in the intervention". This is the so called "counterfactual".

A counterfactual can be found among the non-beneficiaries in the form of a control group. It is not difficult to find a control group, what is difficult is to find a good **control group**. The goodness of a control group depends on its **comparability** with with the beneficiaries (treatment group). If the two groups are not comparable the evaluation can mistake differences in characteristics between the groups for the real (causal) impact of the programme.

Impact evaluations have become extremely popular in the development field (see figure below), and particularly in the social protection field. Practically all major social cash transfer programmes in southern and eastern Africa have been subject to an impact evaluation during the last 10 years and this has contributed in many cases to their coverage expansion and establishment as national programmes.





Yet impact evaluation are only one of the various M&E tools and approaches that are available (see table 4 above). Impact evaluations perform extremely well in regards to the specific question they aim to answer: the causal effects of an interventions. Depending on circumstances such a question may be appropriate, or too narrow.

2.5 DEFINING THE DATA SOURCES

Original data collection for M&E can be an extremely time-consuming and costly activity. For these reasons, identifying existing data sources (i.e. 'where' data comes from), establishing their usefulness for M&E purposes, and planning them carefully to deliver exactly the indicators needed is an important task.

So what are the most useful data sources for a social protection M&E system? Table 10 below outlines the potential strengths and weaknesses of the main data sources available for this sector. These need to be assessed against a countries' context (e.g. institutional set-up, existing databases, etc.).

Table 10: Strengths and weaknesses of selected data sources for a Social protection M&E system

	STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
Program Management Information Systems (MIS) (see also Module MIS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Routinely and readily available Large sample size (e.g. all households registered) Low cost Easy to add additional reports and potentially import data from other sources Can generate useful performance indicators Allows longitudinal tracking 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost/time of designing high quality MIS and reporting Administrative data cannot measure all outcomes and cannot be used for inferences Data is only available when the client is 'in the programme' Indicators may not be specific enough to allow monitoring of vulnerable groups, such as women and girls, people with disability
Standard periodic administrative reporting from visits, spot-checks, audits, etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Simple and often already in place Can be useful to sort out ongoing implementation issues Generates information all the way to beneficiary level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not always filled, used and analysed (often paper-based) Inconsistently applied and focused on procedures (reporting to next level of hierarchy) Not all forms and info reaches central level in useful way (e.g. missed payments) Risks being 'anecdotal'
Qualitative ad-hoc studies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low cost due to smaller required sample size Essential to follow up on issues raised by analysing numbers and to understand why and how things are going wrong Can provide insights on how problems could be addressed and solved Can examine issues in depth and understand how programme works for vulnerable groups 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Require capacity for design, implementation and analysis Low sample Risks being 'anecdotal' if low quality



Table 10: Continued

	STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
Other administrative databases	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Integrating data from with HR and Accounting information for performance indicators Link with Civil Registry and other sectoral databases for integrated M&E Bank/payment provider database for monitoring of payments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to set up institutional arrangements with different stakeholders Cost of setting up data linkages and coordination Ideally requires Unique ID (e.g. National ID number) for linking Ensuring data comparability May not allow for disaggregation by disability and other indicators of vulnerability due to insufficient sample sizes
Official Statistics data (Census, Household Budget Surveys, Living Standard Measurement Surveys, Labour Force Surveys)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can guarantee a wealth of information (household income, consumption, education, health status, etc.) at a very low cost Comprehensive national data from Census or representative surveys could be used to calculate caseload, poverty levels, coverage, etc. Could be used to assess impact and targeting effectiveness if extra question on program receipt added 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires building institutional relationship with national statistics office Requires high capacity for analysis Calculating estimates for lower administrative levels (e.g. district) may not be representative (e.g. especially for under 5) May not allow comparison of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries Ensuring data comparability May not allow for disaggregation by disability and other indicators of vulnerability due to insufficient sample sizes
Externally contracted impact evaluations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Important for understanding causal relationships and generating counterfactuals Needed for indicators analysing targeting effectiveness, impact on consumption, poverty, etc Impartiality of evaluators decreases risk of bias 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very high costs (require independent external evaluators) Results available late in the policy process Seldom feed into programme improvement and planning
Community Monitoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very important to gain bottom up monitoring and assess satisfaction with service delivery (e.g. Citizen Report Cards, Perception Surveys, etc) Allows for participation of community groups and civil society organisations to represent voices of vulnerable groups 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Setting up incentives to make this happen; institutional arrangements, etc. Costly, requires capacity and could be unsustainable



It is important to evaluate and select these potential data sources based on four main criteria:

- **mixing monitoring and evaluation components:** ensuring that monitoring functions do not get over-shadowed by evaluation objectives;
- **building on existing data sources:** helps to reduce cost, makes a system more sustainable, requires less active management and avoids duplication of work. Such sources can be classified as internal (generated and managed by the programme) and external (managed by external actors – require coordination). For example:
 - **Internal:** Programme MISs and integrated systems for information management in the social protection sector can be programmed to offer a vast array of standard M&E reports (see MODULE MIS);
 - **External:** Official Statistics data could offer great insights by simply adding one question on receipt of benefits to existing surveys (e.g. household budget survey);
- **ensuring triangulation** of several types of data sources, both internal and external to the programme. This can enhance analysis potential (see boxes below in this section for an example);
- While data from programme MISs provide substantial information, they do not necessarily help to understand how and why a programme is delivering and meeting beneficiaries’ needs (or isn’t). Qualitative research and approaches to participatory monitoring, triangulated with other sources, can help to address these fundamental issues;
- **minimising the burden of data collection and analysis:** ensuring the data for the system is primarily designed to be generated as an integral part of normal administration rather than as an additional task;
- Ideally an M&E system will feed to the largest possible extent from data that is generated in any event as part of normal operational procedures, so to minimize data collection efforts that are specific to M&E processes. For example, data are entered from the PMT questionnaire into the MIS for the purposes of beneficiary selection and can be used for M&E without any additional effort;
- This also implies automating reporting functions where possible (for example within a program MIS).

Other than the strengths and weaknesses discussed above, a country wishing to set up an M&E framework should also consider each data-source’s: main uses and focus (which areas and indicators within the framework it would address); accessibility (how easy is it to use in practice, especially in the short and medium term); recommended frequency (frequency with which data from that source should be collected and analysed); sample size and; potential cost.

Capturing the experiences of vulnerable groups

It is imperative that data for M&E activities are sensitive and inclusive of the experiences of vulnerable groups, such as women and children and people with disability. Approaches to collecting more gender-sensitive and disability-inclusive data include:

- **Awareness training:** Training M&E staff to have gender and disability awareness and a general understanding of vulnerability and equity in the design of M&E frameworks and systems to design and deliver more inclusive and comprehensive evidence, and collect data in an ethical manner, protecting the identity and privacy of people participating in interviews or other data collection activities.
- **Minimum standards and accountability:** Developing minimum standards in collaboration with organisations representing vulnerable groups (e.g., women’s groups, Organisations of People with Disabilities, etc.) to advise on the M&E process to ensure relevant data on the experience of vulnerable groups are captured; Publish the standards and other relevant communications in formats accessible to vulnerable groups (including Braille, audio, large print, digital text conforming with disability accessibility standards, etc.); Co- designing evaluation questions with representative groups to ensure they capture the experience of vulnerable groups (e.g., access to services that are inclusive and appropriate, addressing discrimination, unpaid care work, etc.).

- **Design and data disaggregation:** Capturing details such as enrolment, drop-outs, access to linked programmes, intra-household issues, and barriers faced by vulnerable groups in monitoring systems; Ensuring that data used for design, monitoring and evaluation allows for disaggregation by disability, gender, and other vulnerability indicators. This may include the use of specific tools to identify and capture the experiences of vulnerable groups. For example, the Washington Group question sets are recommended by the United Nations and other groups for measuring disability in surveys; Ensuring the sample size *s* in evaluations are large enough to conduct meaningful analysis about the experiences of vulnerable groups, including people with disability and other minority groups; Ensuring data collection methods are accessible to vulnerable groups to all self-report (e.g., using Braille, audio, large print, simple language, etc. to meet the needs of participants); Ensuring that relevant household members are engaged to answer questions about their circumstances rather than relying on one household “head” to speak on their behalf.
- **Regular reports:** Produce regular reports on gender, disability, and accessibility issues (and any other issues relevant to vulnerable groups) based on information integrated into programme MIS.

Other than the strengths and weaknesses discussed above, a country wishing to set up an M&E framework should also consider each data-source’s: main uses and focus (which areas and indicators within the framework it would address); accessibility (how easy is it to use in practice, especially in the short and medium term); recommended frequency (frequency with which data from that source should be collected and analysed); sample size and; potential cost.

2.6 DEFINING INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

The institutional arrangements for Social Protection M&E should describe the roles and responsibilities of different organizations and actors within the system, while also outlining ‘how’ the information will be collected, compiled, analysed, reported and used. Guiding principles include the following:

Limited capacity/knowledge on M&E, particularly at decentralized levels

- Time/human resource constraints for M&E activities
- Duplication of reporting lines, parallel or dual reporting within government structures, in some cases including parallel reporting to external funders/implementers (e.g. NGOs, Donors)
- Information extraction, limited feedback provided to decentralized levels and beneficiaries
- Weak link to decentralized decision makers (district, province administration)
- Inward looking M&E system
- Limited/unstructured role for external independent stakeholders (civil society and media)
- Weak link with external partners that undertake relevant M&E work (Statistical Office; Research institutions)
- Ensuring the institutional arrangements of the M&E system **reflect the overall institutional structure of the implementing organisations** (at all levels of decentralisation), while filling any gaps.
- Aligning all activities with the **National Planning Framework**, with guiding legislation based on the government-wide monitoring and evaluation framework.
- Working as much as possible with **existing systems, staff and processes** and helping improve them (build capacity, etc), based on an initial Capacity Assessment (see MODULE ADM)
- Building institutional arrangements with new actors for M&E purposes: requires time, **dedication and in some cases legal frameworks or memoranda of understanding** (e.g. adding an extra question on benefit receipt to national survey by Statistics Bureau)
- **Explicitly budgeting for M&E activities from the outset** and thinking through related staffing needs
- Tasking one person at all levels of management (central, province, etc) specifically with M&E duties as a priority and possibly not as an add-on to other responsibilities (creating role of **M&E officer**);



2.7 TAKE-AWAY LESSONS

Adequate supply of evidence from and M&E system can be achieved when:

- Indicators have been agreed, prioritised and refined as the result of a participatory and iterative process that accounts for the information needs of stakeholders at all levels– including those representing vulnerable populations,, as well as reflecting the programme’s objectives, Theory of Change, Service Standards and core business processes.
- A range of data sources (both internal and external) is adopted, making sure these build on existing sources, minimise the burden of data collection and reporting, and prioritise monitoring over evaluation at the initial stages of programme maturity. Key data sources include: Management Information Systems (MIS); standardperiodic reporting from visits, spot-checks, audits, etc; qualitative ad-hoc studies; other administrative databases; Official Statistics data (Census, Household Budget Surveys, Living Standard Measurement Surveys, Labour Force Surveys); externally contracted impact evaluations; Community Monitoring.
- Institutional arrangements of the M&E system reflect the overall institutional structure of the programme, work with existing systems, staff and processes, and are built acknowledging the need for time, dedication and in some cases legal frameworks or Memoranda of Understanding.
- M&E system and activities apply an equity lens and are inclusive fo the needs of vulnerable groups, reducing bias in results and finding out “what works” for different beneficiary groups

ENSURING DEMAND FOR M&E DATA

3.1 ENHANCING DEMAND FOR M&E

A study conducted by the CLEAR initiative⁸ on demand and supply of M&E information and services in anglophone sub-Saharan Africa⁹ concluded that “none of the governments is described as having established a government-wide culture that supports M&E and Performance Management (PM) and the use of M&E and PM findings (...). 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.” (CLEAR, 2013)

Unless decision makers actively seek evidence to support policy making and programme management, M&E practices are unlikely to take hold. Demand for – and use of - M&E data will be enhanced when:

- At macro-level, **the national policy environment**
- is ‘enabling’ (performance oriented),
- offers an overall institutional culture that fosters linkages between different stakeholders and has actors focused on planning,
- allows for Civil Society (e.g., women’s groups, Organisations of People with Disability) and Donors to play an active role and participate in the shaping of M&E questions, indicators, methodologies, dissemination and other important decisions.

⁸ <https://www.theclearinitiative.org>

⁹ The study reviewed M&E practices in Botswana, Ghana, Kenya, Malawi, Namibia, Rwanda, South Africa, Swaziland, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia, and Zimbabwe.



- At meso-level, **implementing agencies**
 - have a sufficient level of autonomy in decision-making to ensure M&E activities are perceived as useful and not frustrating (i.e. they are allowed to act on their findings),
 - maintain a strong liaison between central and decentralised levels based on mutual feedback and awareness of location-specific constraints (M&E perceived as learning rather than judgement),
 - backed the process of developing an M&E system in the first place, and have a culture of benchmarking performance across different locations,
 - adopt Standard Service Agreements that help to transparently frame objectives in terms of service delivery (see Section 1 below),
 - understand the potential usefulness of it,
 - do not 'fear' M&E as a 'controlling' function,
 - have sufficient capacity to perform their functions (it is not an added burden to other activities and they have the resources to perform their job).
 - include representatives from vulnerable groups (e.g., women and girls, people with disability, older people, youth, etc.) to make finding more context-appropriate and inclusive.
- At the micro-level, **individuals** responsible for M&E
- understand the potential usefulness of it,
- do not 'fear' M&E as a 'controlling' function,
- have sufficient capacity to perform their functions (it is not an added burden to other activities and they have the resources to perform their job).

Best practice internationally includes a balance between 'carrots, sticks and sermons', as summarized in Table 11 below

Table 11: Incentives for utilisation of M&E - carrots, sticks and sermons

CARROTS	STICKS	SERMONS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shift the focus of M&E from 'controlling' to 'learning' • Build forums for local and central level administrators to compare and contrast their experiences (e.g. benchmark across jurisdictions!) • High-level recognition of good or best practice • Budgetary incentives for high performance • Performance contracts for civil servants & M&E as one criterion for staff recruitment, promotion, and certification • Ensuring that data providers understand how their data are used and the importance of providing accurate and timely data • Training for programme managers and staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enact laws, decrees, or regulations mandating M&E & formal requirements for the planning, conduct, and reporting of M&E • Withhold part of funding from units that fail to conduct M&E • Achieve greater transparency by regularly publishing information on all programmes' objectives, outputs, and service quality • Set challenging but realistic performance targets • Involve civil society in M&E of government performance—results in pressures for better performance and accountability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of examples of influential M&E to demonstrate its utility and cost-effectiveness • Frequent repetition of message of support to and use of M&E at all meetings • Awareness-raising, network building and training on M&E function and its use to deliver better services • Support for M&E from multilateral and bilateral donors in their loans to governments—highlights and endorses M&E

Source: adapted from Mackay (2007)



Box 17: Bolsa Familia Decentralized Management Index

Brazil is a federative republic consisting of the Union, states, municipalities and the Federal District. In order to correctly implement public policies in the context of this challenging federative arrangement, appropriate strategies are needed to ensure cooperation and coordination between the various actors. The Federal Constitution rules that Social Assistance is a universal social right embodied in those public policies that apply to the entire country and for which different stakeholders share responsibility. It follows that in the Social Assistance sphere all entities are tasked with implementing the relevant policies, including the Bolsa Familia Program (BFP) and the Unified Registry.

There are two core strategies on which interfederative coordination of the BFP and the Unified Registry is based:

(i) formal commitment to the scheme by federal entities, and (ii) provision of financial support for decentralized management. These mechanisms have enabled the Bolsa Familia Program to expand systematically over the last ten years in all the municipalities and to ensure that benefits are paid to more than 14 million extremely poor Brazilian families.

The signature of a **Term of Adhesion** confers BFP membership on Brazil's 26 states, 5,570 municipalities and the Federal District. This document sets out the standard obligations and responsibilities of each entity that participates in the program.


The Decentralized Management Index (IGD) has been adopted by the MDS to support and encourage the federative entities to invest in maintaining and improving the management of the BFP and the Unified Registry. The IGD allows federal government co-financing to be earmarked for states and municipalities, and thus to partially reimburse the costs involved in running the BFP and the Unified Registry. Central government funds feature as revenue in state and municipal budgets and can therefore be directly applied to managing the BFP.

In addition to confirming the obligations entered into under the Term of Adherence, the IGD serves as an indicator for tracking the quality of BFP and Unified Registry decentralized management, as well as a benchmark control for the MDS to release funds to states and municipalities. The higher the value of the IGD, the greater the amount of funds eligible for transfer.

The index serves as a baseline for calculating the value of funds to be transferred directly from the federal government to the municipalities, states and the DF. The following figure shows the IGD as a cooperation strategy for the decentralized management of the BFP.



Box 17: Continued



Source: WWP (2016)

3.2 ENHANCING THE UPTAKE OF EVIDENCE

Data providers can take explicit efforts to stimulate evidence uptake, by improving:

- **Credibility** can be improved by enhancing the validity, relevance, feasibility, or precision of the M&E information that is generated (see discussion on how this translated in the selection of indicators, data sources and evaluation approaches in Section 2 above)
- **Usability and accessibility** of evidence refers to the tailor made packaging of the information for the user so that it can understood and be used. If a report meant for the Minister is written in technical jargon, it may not be used and will just be “tossed” aside. Similarly, if a report with relevant information for illiterate stakeholders or people with disability is not produced in user-friendly, accessible formats, such as videos with sign language, infographics, Braille, etc., then they will not be able to understand, let alone use the findings. Thus the data collects would have wasted their time and resources. It is important to distil the information and tailor the message, medium and communication strategy to different types of target audience.
- **Access:** In some cases, the data users may want to use evidence for decision making but don't know where to find the information M&E data must be readily available to the different users. The information may be uploaded on a website or portal so that both internal and external users can use it to make decisions. The transparency ensured by Kenya's online data from the Single Registry is a good example of improving access to M&E data. Also, providing local governments with written copies of findings from analysis of M&E data may be helpful in some African contexts where electricity or availability of computers may be a challenge.

The credibility, usability and accessibility of evidence will be increased when it incorporates the perspectives and needs of vulnerable groups, including women and girls and people with disability. Best practice approaches to integrating gender and disability in the use and dissemination and reporting of M&E findings are becoming increasingly more expected not only by civil society, but also by donors and other partners involved in the design and financing of social protection programmes.



3.3 EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING AND THE LEARNING ORGANISATION¹⁰

Under the traditional M&E approach most projects, including in the social protection field follow a standard practice as articulated in project planning or logical framework approaches and define a 'development project' as inputs (financial and other resources), which are translated by an implementing agency into specified activities to produce useful outputs. These outputs have the goal of outcomes and impacts of higher well-being for the intended beneficiaries.

In the last ten years there has been an accelerating rise in the criticism of traditional M&E and a corresponding rise in the prominence given to the use of rigorous techniques for project evaluation. The criticism is of M&E practice that has two key elements: a) evaluation was too ex ante and needed to be more ex post, b) evaluation should be more focused on the impact on outcomes not just inputs, and based on a rigorous counter-factual. This has led to the significant rise of focus on rigorous impact evaluations (see more in Box 12 above).

There are three fundamental reasons why both the traditional M&E approach and the more recent impact evaluation approach fall short of learning needs of most organizations:

- **High dimensional and complex design space implies that learning** 'what works' has to be flexible and dynamic.
- Many development **problems are problems of implementation**—moving from inputs to outputs (for which an impact evaluation that measures outputs to beneficiaries is not yet needed)
- Like human beings, organizations and systems actually **learn through experience**, and not (only) through evidence

3.3.1 Learning through Experience

People learn through a **circular process of action, conceptualization and evaluation**. It involves referring to previous experiences as well as anticipating outcomes. What we do is the result of observation, action, and reflection. Our behavior reflects how we compare experience from the past, deeming them good or bad, successful or unsuccessful. We also look at others - what actions of theirs are good? And last but not least, we develop unique strategies that apply best to our specific situation. Experiential learning is the process of experience, and is more specifically defined as "learning through reflection on doing" (Kolb 2014).

The reality is that with complex endeavors no one can know what will work in advance. Development project managers do not know if the inputs will lead to useful outputs (internal area within their control) or if the outputs created will in turn lead to outcomes and impacts (not within their control). As we have argued above, given the level of granularity at which projects have to be designed one cannot be 'evidence based'— even if one draws on all of the available information. Development projects are not like chemistry—which is complicated but not complex—where we can predict exactly how interactions will work under specified conditions because we have empirically validated invariance laws that cover all the relevant contingencies.

Some projects really are just logistics, the solutions have been tried out and proven in context (both overall and organizational), and hence the purpose of the project is just scaling. However, not all projects are just the logistics of implementing known solutions and hence processes that insist that all projects present themselves either as logistics or as small scale pilots or field experiments create unnecessary fictions and confusions.

Dealing with complexity requires a different approach to programming as well as to monitoring and evaluation, challenging the traditional wisdom that change happens linearly. It requires embedding in the process opportunities for iteration, feedback and continuous learning. From an M&E perspective dealing with complexity required to overcome rigidities of the traditional logframe approach and adopt a more flexible framework for searching and assessing solutions based on continuous practice.


Read more about 'Doing Problem Driven Work' and Problem Driven Iterative Adaptation here: <https://bsc.cid.harvard.edu/>

¹⁰ This Section is based on material from Pritchett (2013) and the PDIA initiative available at <https://bsc.cid.harvard.edu/>



Figure 19: Experiential Learning Cycles

1. David Kolb
2. Roger Greenway
3. Chris Argyris & Donald Schon



Source: ed batista - <https://www.edbatista.com/2007/10/experiential.html>


Development practitioners are well aware that a lot of learning from a project happens after the design, but well before any formal 'evaluation' but as it is this learning is often haphazard and below the radar. The participation of different stakeholder groups is integral to providing insights about the appropriateness of the methodology and interpretation of findings to enable continuous learning and programme improvement. This is particularly relevant for vulnerable groups whose needs are often not captured appropriately or at all. Engaging with women's groups, youth, Organizations of Persons with Disabilities and other civil society representatives not only ensures that their priorities are captured in data collection, but also creates early buy-in, establishes legitimacy of the M&E activity and team, increases uptake of evidence and can reduce criticism that the evaluation (and programme) is gender-blind or not inclusive of disability.

The goal is to bring the currently informal processes of experiential learning, from project implementation, explicitly into the overall strategy of development organizations. Pritchett et al. (2013)' propose to explicitly add a new 'e' in MeE, defined as **structured experiential learning**. This is the process through which an organization learns during the period of project implementation.

In order to maximise experiential learning it must be anchored on an organizational learning strategy which consists of a project specific mix of Monitoring, Experiential Learning and Evaluation (M&E) (see Figure 20 below).



Figure 20: The role of Experiential learning in M&E



3.4 TAKE-AWAY LESSONS

- M&E systems must be designed in such a way so as to strike a balance between the capacity to produce quality evidence in a timely fashion and the demand for evidence of a particular kind needed for decision-making by multiple users.
- To maintain and sustain the supply and demand balance, there should be constant dialogue between data providers and data users coupled with ensuring that the evidence is made usable and accessible to key stakeholders, policymakers and the community and providing incentives to the data users to stimulate uptake of evidence.
- On the demand side of M&E it is important to create a culture of learning and not blame and in this way it ensures the usefulness of the M&E framework to its key users.
- A good M&E system is critical to safeguarding compliance with existing legislation, ensuring transparency and accountability and building a basis for the continuous improvement of social protection systems. A good M&E system promotes a continuous learning cycle, fosters transformation in social protection, and improves service delivery.
- To maximise learning during implementation, organisations should use structured experiential learning and adopt a participatory approach with key stakeholders, including vulnerable groups. In the face of complex challenges change is generally not a linear process, requiring experimental iteration and frequent feedback loops.



CURRICULUM OVERVIEW

The TRANSFORM Learning Package is organized in a modular structure, and reflects the key building blocks of a holistic & interdependent social protection system.

The TRANSFORM modules that are currently available are listed below. Other modules are under development and will be added to the curriculum.

 LEG	Legal Frameworks
 S&I	Selection & Identification
 ADM	Administration and Delivery Systems
 COO	Coordination
 GOV	Governance, Institutions & Organizational Structure
 MIS	Management Information Systems & Approaches to Data Integration
 FIN	Financing & Financial Management
 M&E	Monitoring & Evaluation

All TRANSFORM materials are available at:

www.transformsp.org

WHAT IS TRANSFORM?

TRANSFORM is an innovative learning package on the administration of national social protection floors in Africa. The prime objective of TRANSFORM is to build critical thinking and capacities of policy makers and practitioners at national and decentralized levels to improve the design, effectiveness and efficiency of social protection systems. TRANSFORM aims not only at imparting state-of-the-art knowledge that is appropriate for the challenges faced by countries in the region, but also to encourage learners to take leadership on the change and transformation of nationally defined social protection systems.

WHY TRANSFORM?

Many training curricula exist in the field of social protection and thus fundamental ideas, concepts, approaches and techniques are accessible. And yet, institutions and individuals struggle with the complexity of developing a broad, encompassing social protection system.

This complexity requires a transformational approach to teaching and knowledge sharing. It is far from enough to impart knowledge, to fill heads. It requires learners to grapple with the features of complexity, to stimulate creativity, to appreciate diversity and uniqueness, to be involved as a key element of ownership –elements which are at least as important as the factual knowledge itself. This learning package aims at just that: TRANSFORM!

All TRANSFORM materials including this manual are licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial- ShareAlike 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>

See more on cover page.

Contact the TRANSFORM initiative at: transform_socialprotection@ilo.org

or visit www.transformsp.org

IMPLEMENTED, SUPPORTED AND DRIVEN BY:



ECOWAS
CEDEAO



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



International
Labour
Organization



International Training Centre



Ingenious Peoples Knowledge
Why not unleash ingenuity within systems?



UNU-MERIT

