

## ANNEX 3: M&E CAPACITY ASSESSMENT

### SCORECARD

In order to facilitate the assessment of national M&E capacity, a checklist of questions to be addressed is provided, which may be used in two ways. The short method is appropriate when the primary objective is to raise awareness and stimulate interest in M&E capacity building in general. The full method is more suitable when the end objective is to prepare a proposal for an M&E capacity-building programme.

**The short method.** The short method is based on group discussions only and is suitable as a workshop exercise. The workshop consists of potentially interested stakeholders, possibly including donors and representatives of international organizations. Using this method, the full assessment could be completed in a few hours. It involves no data collection per se, but depends on having a well-informed group of stakeholders – including representatives from the private sector, civil society, and possibly donors – who are already familiar with ongoing M&E activities in the country. The discussants use the checklist of about 3 questions and their own knowledge of how M&E works in their country to ascertain a country score. The score represents a rough measure of the gap that separates the current, less-than-ideal situation from the ideal situation.

**The full method.** The full method is longer and involves data collection using surveys and interviews with a broad cross-section of data users and providers. The survey questionnaire should be built around the same checklist. This could be an appropriate assignment for a task force or consultant. The assignment would involve the design, implementation and initial analysis of the survey, including the preparation of a questionnaire to be administered to a carefully selected sample of users and providers. This phase could take several weeks.

Whichever route is used, the objective is to accumulate sufficient information to fill out the scorecard. The scorecard is divided into five sections: Basic (project-level) M&E capacity; sector-level M&E capacity; poverty monitoring; national-level M&E capacity; subnational-level M&E capacity; and potential for expansion. Each of the sections contains from five to eight questions that the focus groups are required to address. Next to each question are three multiple-choice answers. Basically, the groups are required to focus on different M&E activities and to rank the country capacity and experience in each area on a score of –3 (= no capacity;

1 = very limited capacity; 2 = some capacity; 3 = good capacity). The groups will review each question individually, mark the most appropriate answer and record the matching score in the box on the far right of each question. When all the questions have been completed, the scores are added up section by section, and the totals are then transferred to a summary scoresheet.

**Table A3.1 M&E capacity assessment scoresheet**

Summary Scoresheet	Scores	Max
A. Basic (project-level) M&E capacity		24
B. Sector-level M&E capacity		12
C. Poverty monitoring		15
D. National-level M&E capacity		21
E. Subnational-level M&E capacity		15
F. Potential for expansion		9
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>96</b>

Since the answers are obviously subjective, they cannot be interpreted in absolute terms, but in general terms only. Countries with an overall score of less than 25 points usually have the least capacity; countries with 25–50 points have some fairly limited M&E activities; and those with 50–75 points have strong competencies. Countries scoring over 75 points are considered to have strong overall capacity. Having ascertained the country’s overall capacity level, the discussants should then refer back to the questions on a section-by-section basis to identify where specifically capacity is weakest.

## M&E capacity assessment scorecard

<b>1. Basic (project-level) M&amp;E capacity</b>					
Most ARD programme/projects have an active M&E component.	[1] Strongly disagree	[2] Disagree	[3] Neither agree nor disagree	[4] Agree	[5] Strongly agree
Most ARD projects have their own M&E units.	[1] Strongly disagree	[2] Disagree	[3] Neither agree nor disagree	[4] Agree	[5] Strongly agree
The logframe is generally used for project design and M&E.	[1] Strongly disagree	[2] Disagree	[3] Neither agree nor disagree	[4] Agree	[5] Strongly agree
The monitoring of inputs and outputs is generally well executed.	[1] Strongly disagree	[2] Disagree	[3] Neither agree nor disagree	[4] Agree	[5] Strongly agree
Most projects use computerized Management Information Systems (MISs).	[1] Strongly disagree	[2] Disagree	[3] Neither agree nor disagree	[4] Agree	[5] Strongly agree
Most projects produce regular monitoring reports.	[1] Strongly disagree	[2] Disagree	[3] Neither agree nor disagree	[4] Agree	[5] Strongly agree
Monitoring reports influence the allocation of resources for the next reporting period.	[1] Strongly disagree	[2] Disagree	[3] Neither agree nor disagree	[4] Agree	[5] Strongly agree
Project M&E units have the capacity to carry out surveys on intended beneficiaries.	[1] Strongly disagree	[2] Disagree	[3] Neither agree nor disagree	[4] Agree	[5] Strongly agree
<b>Project-level M&amp;E capacity score =</b>					
<b>2. Sector-level M&amp;E Capacity</b>					
Project M&E activities are well coordinated.	[1] Strongly disagree	[2] Disagree	[3] Neither agree nor disagree	[4] Agree	[5] Strongly agree
Sector ministries concerned with ARD have M&E units.	[1] Strongly disagree	[2] Disagree	[3] Neither agree nor disagree	[4] Agree	[5] Strongly agree
These units produce timely, reliable and useful progress reports.	[1] Strongly disagree	[2] Disagree	[3] Neither agree nor disagree	[4] Agree	[5] Strongly agree
These units work on both the monitoring of performance and the measurement of results.	[1] Strongly disagree	[2] Disagree	[3] Neither agree nor disagree	[4] Agree	[5] Strongly agree
<b>Sector-level M&amp;E capacity score =</b>					

<b>3. Poverty monitoring (Which of the following elements feature in the poverty monitoring programme?)</b>				
Is there a Poverty Monitoring Unit and how effective is it?	[1] No unit	[2] Not very effective	[3] Effective	[4] Very effective
Is there a National Household Survey (including household consumption data) executed every 3-5 years by the NSO or equivalent?	[1] No survey	[2] Unreliable or outdated survey	[3] Adequate survey	[4] Good survey
Is there regular collection of service delivery indicators?	[1] No collection	[2] Unreliable collection	[3] Fairly good collection	[4] Good collection
Are there qualitative poverty surveys/studies?	[1] No studies	[2] Poor studies	[3] Fairly good studies	[4] Good studies
Are there annual/biennial poverty monitoring reports	[1] No Reports	[2] Irregular reports	[3] Fairly good reports	[4] Good reliable reports
<b>Poverty monitoring capacity score =</b>				
<b>4. National-level M&amp;E capacity</b>				
Is there a National M&E Unit and how effective is it?	[1] Non-existent	[2] Very limited influence	[3] Moderately effective	[4] Very effective
Is there a National M&E Coordinating Committee (or equivalent) and how effective is it?	[1] Non-existent	[2] Very limited influence	[3] Moderately effective	[4] Very effective
Does the M&E system produce regular (annual) PRS progress reports?	[1] No Report	[2] Irregular Reports	[3] Fairly good reports	[4] Good reliable reports
Are there econometric modelling studies?	[1] No capacity	[2] Very limited capacity	[3] Some capacity	[4] Good capacity
Does the M&E system have the capacity to undertake impact evaluation studies?	[1] No capacity	[2] Very limited capacity	[3] Some capacity	[4] Good capacity
What capacity is available to plan and execute a programme of household surveys?	[1] No capacity	[2] Very limited capacity	[3] Some capacity	[4] Good capacity
How easy is it for interested users to gain access to primary data sets for carrying out further research and analysis?	[1] Not Possible	[2] Very difficult	[3] Moderately difficult	[4] Moderately easy
<b>National M&amp;E capacity score =</b>				
<b>5. Subnational-level M&amp;E capacity</b>				
Are there the necessary structures at the subnational level to carry out M&E activities?	[1] No capacity	[2] Very limited capacity	[3] Some capacity	[4] Good capacity
Are regular (annual) PRS progress reports produced at the subnational levels?	[1] No Reports	[2] Irregular reports	[3] Fairly good reports	[4] Good reliable reports
Is there a standard financial record-keeping and accounting system?	[1] No system	[2] Very limited system	[3] Some capacity	[4] Good system
What capacity is available at the subnational levels to produce annual estimates of agricultural and livestock production?	[1] No capacity	[2] Very limited capacity	[3] Some capacity	[4] Good capacity
What capacity is available to carry out household surveys?	[1] No capacity	[2] Very limited capacity	[3] Some capacity	[4] Good capacity
<b>Subnational M&amp;E capacity score =</b>				
<b>6. Potential for expansion</b>				
Is there any experience and/or capacity for community-level monitoring?	[1] No capacity	[2] Very limited capacity	[3] Some capacity	[4] Good capacity
Do the M&E activities include any form of corruption monitoring?	[1] No	[2] Very limited	[3] Some	[4] A lot
Does the media (radio, newspapers, etc.) promote a wider dissemination and discussion of M&E results?	[1] No	[2] Very limited	[3] Some	[4] A lot
<b>Future directions score =</b>				





The Sourcebook provides a number of workable approaches for designing an M&E system that would be of greatest relevance to different agricultural and rural development (ARD) activities, projects and programmes, and degree of data availability.

A set of 19 priority indicators based on the criteria of comparability, availability and relevance have been identified for the purpose of international comparisons. It is expected that most countries, regardless of the stage of development of their monitoring system and statistical capacity, will be in position to provide periodic data on these indicators.

A comprehensive set of 86 indicators validated in countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America, covering all subsectors of ARD and some thematic areas, offers M&E professionals, project planners and policy-makers a ready-made menu to select the indicators that best suit their needs. In preparing the menu, due care has been taken to include indicators that are workable even in situations where data availability is less-than-ideal.

ISBN 978-92-5-106082-7



9 789251 060827

TC/M/10380E/1/10.08/3000