

# Preliminary Examples of Good Practice

[barry.smith@iied.org](mailto:barry.smith@iied.org)

# Outline

- Evaluative Framework – how we assessed different national approaches and systems
- Emerging good practice – evidence from 3 countries
- Short reflection exercise
- Typology: categorisation of different systems

# The Evaluative Framework

## Methodological Parameters

**Frameworks/countries that holistically assess adaptation success**

**Frameworks that go beyond output focussed projectised M&E**

**Integration of Learning**

**Context specific aggregable Indictors**

**Theory of Change**

**Integrated framework**

# The Evaluative Framework

## Operational Parameters

**Building on existing systems**

**Links with development planning**

**MEL Capacity and Financing**

**Reporting Efficiency & Complementarity**

**Political support**

**Strong institutional mechanisms**

# Overview of Results – methodological parameters

Methodological Parameters	Country Results
<b>Frameworks/countries that holistically assess adaptation success</b>	Cambodia / Kenya / Columbia / Mali / Senegal / Mozambique
<b>Frameworks that go beyond output focussed projectised M&amp;E</b>	Cambodia / Kenya / Columbia / South Africa / Mexico / Mali / Senegal / Mozambique
<b>Integration of Learning</b>	Cambodia / Kenya / Columbia / Mali / Senegal / Mozambique
<b>Context specific aggregable Indictors</b>	Cambodia / Kenya / Columbia / Mali / Senegal / Mozambique
<b>Theory of Change</b>	Cambodia / Kenya / Columbia / Mexico / Mali / Senegal / Mozambique
<b>Integrated framework</b>	Kenya / Philippines / Mali / Senegal / Mozambique

# Overview of Results – operational parameters

Operational Parameters	Country Results
<b>Building on existing systems</b>	Cambodia / Mexico
<b>Links with development planning</b>	Philippines / Mexico / Colombia / South Africa / Uganda / Nepal / Morocco
<b>MEL Capacity and Financing</b>	Mexico
<b>Reporting Efficiency &amp; Complementarity</b>	Philippines / South Africa
<b>Political support</b>	Colombia / South Africa
<b>Strong institutional mechanisms</b>	Mexico / South Africa / Philippines / Colombia

# Preliminary Good Practice – national examples

# Colombia's National Results-Based Management & Evaluation System

## Sistema Nacional de Evaluación de Resultados de la Gestión Pública (SINERGIA)

<b>Background</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Established 1994</li><li>• Spans whole of government</li></ul>
<b>Framework / Overview</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• System of indicators (500) via on-line sub-system: Sistema de Programación y Gestión por Objetivos y Resultados (<b>SIGOB</b>)</li><li>• Agenda of impact evaluations</li><li>• Formal dissemination channels</li></ul>
<b>Institutions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Directorate for Evaluation of Public Policy (<b>DEPP</b>) under National Department of Planning (<b>DNP</b>)</li><li>• National Council for Economic and Social Policy (<b>CONPES</b>)</li></ul>
<b>Evidence of Impacts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Culture of reporting and managing for results</li><li>• Evaluations inform policymaking</li></ul>
<b>Barriers &amp; challenges</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• High staff turnover</li><li>• No regular data audits</li><li>• High cost of evaluations</li><li>• Reliance on external consultants</li></ul>



# Colombia's National Results-Based Management & Evaluation System

## Sistema Nacional de Evaluación de Resultados de la Gestión Pública (SINERGIA)

<b>Good elements</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Strong transparency</li><li>• Assists policymakers to make evidence-informed decisions</li><li>• Evaluations are neutral</li><li>• Used as an oversight mechanism by President</li><li>• SINERGIA plays key role in embedding SDGs in development</li></ul>
<b>Success Factors</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Strong policy/legislative foundation</li><li>• Political buy-in</li><li>• M&amp;E function operates as part of government</li><li>• Separate budget for evaluations</li></ul>
<b>Lessons</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• High level political support helps</li><li>• Political clout of main M&amp;E institution</li><li>• Neutrality of institution responsible for evaluations</li><li>• Cross government coordination on evaluation agenda</li></ul>

# The Philippines: Results-Based Monitoring & Evaluation

## Results-Based Monitoring and Evaluation System (RBMES)

<b>Framework / Overview</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• System is geared towards adaptation M&amp;E</li><li>• 102 indicators for against outcomes across different timeframes;</li><li>• Data from national and sub-national levels</li><li>• Evaluation report every 3 years – coincides with national development plan</li></ul>
<b>Background</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Well elaborated climate change M&amp;E</li><li>• Strong development results-based management system</li></ul>
<b>Institutions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Climate Change Commission (CCC)</li><li>• M&amp;E Technical Working Group (TWG)</li><li>• Philippines Statistic Authority (PSA)</li></ul>
<b>Evidence of Impacts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Standardisation of indicators across scales</li><li>• Development of core flexible indicators</li><li>• Scope for use of contextualised data</li></ul>
<b>Barriers &amp; challenges</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• CCC may lack political influence</li><li>• Shifting baselines and time lag</li></ul>

# The Philippines: Results-Based Monitoring & Evaluation

## Results-Based Monitoring and Evaluation System (RBMES)

<b>Good elements</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Builds on previous initiatives rather than duplication; data gathered from existing sources</li><li>• Takes account of longer timeframes for adaptation</li><li>• Strong links with development M&amp;E inc. SDGs</li><li>• Strong coordination mechanism for adaptation M&amp;E</li></ul>
<b>Success Factors</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Well elaborated policy for RBMES</li><li>• Built around existing M&amp;E systems</li><li>• Inter-agency cooperation</li></ul>
<b>Lessons</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Strong starting point through well elaborated policy</li><li>• Cooperation and coordination across the government</li><li>• Ample time given for development of M&amp;E system</li><li>• Early recognition that adaptation and development M&amp;E should align</li></ul>

# South Africa: National Evaluation System

## South Africa's National Evaluation System (NES)

<b>Framework / Overview</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Management Performance Assessment Tool</li><li>• National Evaluation Plan</li><li>• Evaluations feed into Cabinet decision-making</li></ul>
<b>Background</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Government-wide M&amp;E</li></ul>
<b>Institutions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• National Treasury</li><li>• Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation <b>(DPME)</b> (sits under the Presidency)</li></ul>
<b>Evidence of Impacts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Successfully and sustainably introduced</li><li>• M&amp;E informs policy decisions</li><li>• Capacity built across government</li><li>• Understanding of linkages across government</li><li>• Increased number of evaluations and guidance</li></ul>
<b>Barriers &amp; challenges</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Lack of data quality</li></ul>

# South Africa: National Evaluation System

## South Africa's National Evaluation System (NES)

### Good elements

- Cross- government buy-in
- Demand-driven approach to evaluation
- Focus on impacts

### Success Factors

- Well considered process for developing M&E system – learning from other national experiences
- High-level political support
- Cohort of 'champions' selected from across government
- Outreach by DPME
- Transparency in evaluations

### Lessons

- High-level buy-in essential
- Coalitions of champions can help create enabling conditions
- Emphasis on evaluations can help bring about improvement

# Quick Reflection

- In small groups or pairs for 5 minutes – discuss the following:
  - *How do you feel your national M&E systems demonstrates some of the good practice elements?*
  - *What has stood out from the different case studies?*
  - *Is there anything that has been presented that is relevant to your national M&E systems?*

# The Evaluative Framework – Reflection Exercise

<b>Methodological Parameters</b>	<b>Operational Parameters</b>
<b>Frameworks/countries that holistically assess adaptation success</b>	<b>Building on existing systems</b>
<b>Frameworks that go beyond output focussed projectised M&amp;E</b>	<b>Links with development planning</b>
<b>Integration of Learning</b>	<b>MEL Capacity and Financing</b>
<b>Context specific aggregable Indictors</b>	<b>Reporting Efficiency &amp; Complementarity</b>
<b>Theory of Change</b>	<b>Political support</b>
<b>Integrated framework</b>	<b>Strong institutional mechanisms</b>

# Identified type of Country System: typology

- I. Dedicated climate change / adaptation MEL systems
- II. Adaptation MEL systems linked to global results frameworks
  - I. National adaptation systems using data gathered at the sub-national level;
  - I. MEL linked national development MEL/reporting systems



# Thank you!

Barry Smith

[barry.smith@iied.org](mailto:barry.smith@iied.org)