Monitoring, evaluation and reporting – a key component of management of the Masibambane Programme
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Some Basic M&E Concepts and Definitions

- Monitoring
- Reporting
- Evaluation
- Objectives of M&E
- Key Principles of M&E
- Development of Monitoring Framework
Development of Monitoring and Evaluation to support sustainability of the Masibambane Programme

• Sustainability of MSB programme dependent on monitoring, evaluation and reporting of measurable sector indicators and targets:
  o physical services delivery;
  o financial execution; and
  o “soft-issue” components (such as gender, training, employment creation and environment)

• M&E&R targets defined in the Strategic Framework for Water Services:
  o national for strategy and policy;
  o regional for tactical planning; and
  o local Water Services Authorities for implementation and operations, measured against 19 knowledge topics.
Identify the Service Delivery Paths by:
1. Listing each of the Key Service Points where a Product or Service is delivered to your customers (Key Service Points).
2. For each KSP define the functions that contribute to its delivery at the:
   • Strategic stage – where the overall objectives & parameters are defined.
   • Tactical Planning stage – where you assign budget and decide how to go about it.
   • Operational stage – where you do it and then maintain it.
Future monitoring responsibilities

Strategic Perspective

Service Delivery Function
- Implement Changes
- Operate
- Maintain

Operational Delivery

Tactical Planning Perspective

Service Delivery Path
- Planning
- Design

Development Coordination Function
- Budgets and Detailed Project Implementation Plans
- Parameters, Guidelines and Objectives

Strategic & Regulatory Function
- Strategy
- Policy

Service Delivery Points
- Service Delivery Outputs
“Cross-cutting” Critical Outcome Criteria influence the way things are carried out in order to bring about the desired outcome in line with Strategic Objectives.
Indicator contribution to Key Focus Areas

Cross-cutting Disciplines
- Cross-cutting disciplines influence the process at all levels

M&E Knowledge Topic Framework
- Full set of indicators grouped according to logical data element flows

Programme Report View
- Programme Detailed KPA Topics

Knowledge Topic Framework
- Level 1 Strategic Indicators
- Level 2 Tactical Indicators
- Level 3 Operational Indicators

Service Delivery Paths
- Service Delivery KPI’s: 10
- Cross-cutting KPI’s: 37

Programme Report View
- Key Performance Indicators
- Used to Produce
- Knowledge Topic Indicators
## INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Input indicators</strong></td>
<td>Inputs are the resources (for example financial, human resources) fed into a process or resources consumed to produce an output. Input indicators are used to measure resources. These indicators measure economy and efficiency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process indicators</strong></td>
<td>Processes are the set of activities followed to produce the output.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Progress (level of achievement) indicators</strong></td>
<td>Progress is the level of achievement against output.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outputs indicators</strong></td>
<td>Outputs are the products of a process, in other words the result achieved or delivered. They are usually expressed in quantitative terms - ability to quantify the result i.e. number of or % of. Output indicators relate to programme activities or processes. Output indicators are used to measure the activities or processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes indicators</strong></td>
<td>Actual outcomes are the results produced by some action or condition associated with a programme or service. The focus here is on the ultimate “why” of providing the programme or service. Outcomes should reflect the objectives of a programme or service, so it is important to measure performance in relation to outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Quarterly reporting

• History
  o Donor driven, now elaborated to be SFWS driven

• Principles
  o SFWS
  o Sector needs to report
  o Management value

• Process
  o Involvement of sector partners
  o Gradual development over time
  o Management Reports for DWAF and Sector

• Progress
  o Initial indicators identified
  o Indicators refined
  o Task team, Meetings and One on one discussions
  o 80% sector report now being produced
Sector wide Reporting
Framework for Financial Reporting

Grand total budget = R 6,626bn

Quadrant 1
DWAF
WSS specific
Capital – R479m
Recurrent R 1,104bn

Quadrant 2
Non DWAF
WSS specific
Capital MIG – R 2,282bn
Capital DFID – R 14m
Recurrent – R 2,679bn

Quadrant 3
Not WSS specific

Quadrant 4
Non DWAF
Not WSS specific
Capital – R nil
Recurrent – R 66m

Grand total budget = R 6,626bn
Conceptual development of the quarterly report over 3 years

Year 1
Q1
Q2
Q3
Q4

Year 2
Q1
Q2
Q3
Q4

Year 3
Q1
Q2
Q3
Q4

New Indicators

Refine indicators
External Evaluations

- Internal progress monitoring and reporting performed on a monthly, quarterly and annual basis by sector stakeholders;
- External independent evaluations, conducted by a team of local and international experts, every 18 months to evaluate:
  - the effectiveness, efficiency and impact of the programme against the indicators formulated by the sector, as defined in the SFFWS;
  - The continued relevance and sustainability of the programme is also evaluated to determine whether the programme should continue or whether programme funds should be directed elsewhere;
  - and to make recommendations for improvement.
- 3 external evaluations to date, where WSS has consistently implemented recommendations from these external evaluations with the result that the programme has grown incrementally to reflect the overall sector.
Challenges

• KPIs used in the early years of the programme were effective in measuring whether targets were achieved, but did not cover quality or sustainability issues;
• Early reluctance to use a simplistic, interim M&E system by stakeholders, whilst the system was incrementally being developed;
• “double counting” of beneficiaries a real problem, specifically between dplg and DWAF, who each have its own M&E system;
• Integration of KPI’s of DWAF and dplg (as well as the other sector players) has been problematic as each of the systems had a different focus.
• Previously there was inconsistent treatment of reporting of work-in-progress by the Regional offices and DWAF National – standard definitions were required;
• Maintaining DWAF’s M&E function whilst transforming itself from service delivery implementer to sector regulator;
Challenges continued

- Institutional Implications
  - Restructuring of current arrangements to ensure effective and dedicated team – focus to collect data from various sources

- Information Technology Implications
  - Common and one framework
  - Variety of systems – DWAF and sector
  - Access to data from these systems
  - Common data definitions

- Change Management Implications
  - Restructured DWAF with new roles and responsibilities
  - Roles and responsibilities of sector partners
  - Jointly accepting the challenge
  - Adopting and incorporating the identified indicators in the Monitoring frameworks
  - Capacity support to assist Local Government may be necessary
Conclusion

• M&E&R is more than quantitative analysis of performance;
• Greater emphasis needs to be placed on issues of sustainability, specifically in terms of post-construction M&E, with a focus on “value for money”;
• post-implementation indicators to facilitate continuous learning and improvement of current knowledge base;
• M&E system to follow an incremental development of indicators to ensure support and sustainability of system;
• M&E sustainability dependent on consistency, accuracy and timeous information flow, providing different perspectives (operational, planning, strategic) to sector roleplayers
The future

- Virtual monitoring and reporting system
- Clear roles and responsibilities for all
- Common framework, systems alignment, inter and intra operability of systems between Departments
- Movement towards one strategy, one work plan and one reporting system.