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Mysterious Contradiction

Everybody claims “We got a success!!” (about its aid activity).

But nothing has changed in last 50 years: People are still poor in developing countries.
“Island effect” evaluation

.....This is the “Island Effect”.

We should move toward “Sector-wide effect” evaluation

.....Let’s reform the “Whole Ocean”.
But what approach should be adopted and how should be evaluated?
What can we do?

(1) First of all, let’s terminate stand-alone project / program

･･･ and･･･
(2) Apply **Sector-wide program**

- Coordinated & single Strategy
- Coordinated & single expenditure
- Coordinated & single Implementation
First feature:

Coordinated & single Strategy
## Tanzania ASDS Logframe
(One page summary version)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGRICULTURAL SECTOR DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY (ASDS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DURATION: 2002 - 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SUMMARIES OF PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES, OUTPUTS AND INTERVENTIONS

### OVERALL GOAL
- Contribute to overall GDP growth, national and household incomes and growth in export earnings.

### PURPOSE
- To stimulate and facilitate agricultural sector growth and reduce rural poverty

### STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES
- To create an enabling and favourable environment for improving productivity and profitability of the agricultural sector
- To increase farm incomes in order to reduce rural poverty and ensure households food security.

### OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS
- Real agricultural GDP growth from 3.6 per cent p.a. to 5.0 per cent p.a. by 2005/07.

### MEANS OF VERIFICATION
- Annual Economic Review Reports
- National Bureau of Statistics

### ASSUMPTIONS
- Political will and economic stability.

- Population below poverty line from 48 percent to 24 percent by year 2010.
- Rural population below basic poverty reduced from 57 percent to 29 percent by year 2010.
- Reducing proportion of food poor from 27 percent to 14 percent by year 2010.

- Quarterly and Annual Survey Reports
- Poverty monitoring master plan

- Stable macro-economic policy and implementation of sector reform.
Second feature:

Coordinated & single Expenditure
Coordinated & Single Expenditure

It is just application of “investment fund” in private sector.
Table 1. Total Expenditure (Local and Foreign-Funded) by Agricultural Sector Ministries (TShs Billions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>1998/99</th>
<th>1999/00</th>
<th>2000/01</th>
<th>2001/02</th>
<th>2002/03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>approved</td>
<td>actual</td>
<td>approved</td>
<td>actual</td>
<td>approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurrent</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Estimate of Overall ASDP Requirements (TShs Billion)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Programme</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Recurrent</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>217.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type A</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>230.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type B</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>133.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type C</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Development</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>89.0</td>
<td>106.8</td>
<td>383.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Total</td>
<td>92.8</td>
<td>106.6</td>
<td>121.3</td>
<td>138.3</td>
<td>158.2</td>
<td>617.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country/Program</td>
<td>Sector Policy Framework</td>
<td>Overall cost/Funding Support by the World Bank and other donors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Ethiopia/Health | Health Sector Development Program                                            | Overall: US$715M (6 years)  
                        |                                                              | WB: US$100M  
                        |                                                              | Other donors: US$215M |
| Ethiopia/Education | 20-year Education M/P and Education Sector Development Program (EDSP)      | Total: US$1,800M (5 years)  
                        |                                                              | WB: US$100M  
                        |                                                              | Other donors: US$180M |
| Gambia/Education | Revised Education Policy, M/P and Investment Program                        | Overall: US$51.3M (6 years)  
                        |                                                              | WB: US$20M  
                        |                                                              | Other donors: US$22M |
| Ghana/Health    | Medium-term Health Strategy toward Vision 2020                              | Overall: US$825M (5 years)  
                        |                                                              | WB: US$35M  
                        |                                                              | Other donors: US$200M |
| Mozambique/Education | The National Education Policy and Strategies for Implementation (NEPS) and revisions | Overall: US$717.2M (5 years)  
                        |                                                              | WB: US$71M  
                        |                                                              | Other donors: US$118.8M  
                        |                                                              | NGOs: US$30M |
| Senegal/Health  | 10-year National Health Plan and 5-year action plan                         | Overall: US$410M (5 years)  
                        |                                                              | WB: US$50M  
                        |                                                              | Other donors: 14 donors will contribute funds. |
                        |                                                              | WB: US$56M  
                        |                                                              | Other donors: US$141M |
| Zambia/Education | Basic Education Sub-sector Investment Program (BESSIP)                     | Overall: US$340M (3 years)  
                        |                                                              | WB: US$40M (12%)  
                        |                                                              | Other donors: $129M (38%) |

2) Institute of Health Sector Development, Mapping of Sector Wide Approach in Health Sector, 2003
Third feature:

Coordinated & single Implementation
It is a “Proposal-base development”.

Each district makes and submits its development plan.

Within the common strategy & support base.
Donors are:

Supervisors & no more implementation

Coordinated & Single Implementation
So now,

- Coordinated & single Strategy
- Coordinated & single expenditure
- Coordinated & single Implementation

What about M & E??
The EU’s definition

- An approved sectoral policy document & overall strategic framework
- A sectoral medium–term expenditure framework & an annual budget.
- A co-ordination process among the donors in the sector, led by government

The World Bank’s definition

- A government-led partnership with key external partners
- Based on a comprehensive sector policy & expenditure framework
- Relying on government institutions & common procedures for implementation.

The OECD’s definition

(a) an approved sector strategy
(b) a costed expenditure framework with a medium term horizon
(c) a government-led system & process for coordination among donors supporting the sector

No mention about M & E.

Surprise, surprise…… but;
**M & E**

**Joint Reviews are planned:**
- Annual review;
- Mid-term review;
- Final review

*In exchange of them, money would be distributed.*

**Common methods:**
- Literature review
- Key informant interview at the central level.
- Field visit
- Examination of statistics
- Consultation of donor-government meetings.

(1) **Physical progress report**
(2) **Financial progress report**
**M & E**

Joint Reviews are planned:
- Annual review; (2) Mid-term review; (3) Final review

Experienced results:
- Low submission rate from districts.
- Very low quality of the reports from districts.
- The reviews at central levels are:
  
  1. Too much focus on what happened at the center level.
  2. Quick and incomprehensive data examination
  3. Finally it is frequently difficult to verify the effectiveness of the conducted sector-wide program.
     (But sometimes, it was verified at least at output level.
     E.g.) Education sector of Tanzania

In exchange of them, money would be distributed.
Now, 24 sector programs were underway in 12 African countries in 2002. Active donors; DANIDA, DFID(UK), GTZ/KfW, Italy, Netherlands, Belgium Switzerland, Finland, NORAD, Japan, the World Bank, the African Development Bank (AfDB) and the European Union.
Example of M & E experience 1:
Failure to choose right indicators:
Zambia’s Health
Example of M & E experience 2:

Adjustment needed in M&E:

Mozambique GBM
Example of M & E experience 3:

Very late to focus on M&E:
Tanzania’s ASDP
Strengths and Opportunities of current M & E practice

1) By developing a logical framework, goals, objectives, indicators, and target values are shared between government and donors and among donors.

2) Monitoring activities are installed as a country-wide activities.

3) Evaluation information have been actually used for key decision-making by some degree.
Weakness and constraints of current M & E in SWAps

1) M&E does not get enough attention at an initial stage of a sector program.
2) M&E guidelines are usually made in a later stage of a sector program.
3) Serious examination is not conducted to choose performance indicators.
4) Unsolved discussion: Should we focus output more or outcome more?
5) Lack of incentives to conduct M & E at local levels.

6) Monitoring is now responsible of the host governments but they do not have enough capacity and resources.

7) Merit of criteria: whose values should be applied for sector program evaluation? Review??
Final comment

Effectiveness of SWAps on the whole sector has not been confirmed yet in general.

If people don’t see M&E as an essential part, this new aid approach, SWAps, would pass away just like the traditional stand-alone project approach.
Annex: Additional observation

• SWAps as international discussion arena.
My comments for promoting good SWAps (especially for stakeholder coordination)

- For North European aid donors
- For American aid agencies
- For Japanese aid agencies
- For the host governments (in Africa)
Thank you very much!!
And
Asante Sana!!