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1. Introduction

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) is a Crucial Exercise in Economic Development. M&E provides an efficient methodology to improve design of any development activities, supervise their implementation, and track results. M&E of development activities provides government officials, development managers, and civil society with better means for learning from past experience, improving service delivery, planning and allocating resources, and demonstrating results as part of accountability to key stakeholders. Within the development community, there is a strong focus on results, this helps explain the growing interest in M&E. Yet there is often confusion about what M&E entails.

M&E at the OECD. According to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), monitoring can be defined as: “a continuing function that uses systematic collection of data on specified indicators to provide management and the main stakeholders of an ongoing development intervention with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of objectives and progress in the use of allocated funds.” The OECD defines evaluation as “the process of determining the worth or significance of a development activity, policy, or program [...] to determine the relevance of objectives, the efficacy of design and implementation, the efficiency or resource use, and the sustainability of results. An evaluation should enable the incorporation of lessons learned into the decision-making process of both partner and donor.”
2. M&E at the World Bank

**Focusing on Results.** M&E at the World Bank increases accountability by assessing how the objectives of strategies, programs, or projects have been achieved. This approach allows for the application of a common metric across the wide array of sectors and countries, facilitating comparison across different projects. The World Bank has adopted a result-based approach for the evaluation of any strategies, programs, or projects.

**M&E is Based on Indicators.** Effective M&E is based on a sound selection of indicators and data collection to track them. In any development strategies, programs, or projects, indicators are measures of:

(i) inputs, or financial resources needed to perform an activity;
(ii) processes, or flow of actions to perform an activity;
(iii) outputs, or tangible deliverables associated with an activity;
(iv) outcomes, or objectives generated by the activity at micro level; and
(v) impacts, or higher level objectives generated by the activity at macro level.

When supported with comprehensive data collection, perhaps involving formal surveys, analysis and reporting, indicators enable managers to track progress, demonstrate results, and take corrective actions to improve service delivery. Participation of key stakeholders in defining indicators is important because they are then more likely to understand and use indicators for managing decision-making. Indicators may include qualitative, quantitative, timing, cost, and place parameters. Indicators are measurable in terms of three main metrics: quality, quantity, and time (QQT). Location and cost can also be added for certain indicators. The concept of indicators and the logical framework described above are connected with the LogFrame, Theory-Based Evaluation, Cost-Benefit and Cost-Effectiveness Analysis, and Impact Evaluation.

**LogFrame.** Created in 1969 for the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), the logical framework (LogFrame) helps to clarify objectives of any development strategies, programs, or projects. It aids in the identification of the expected causal links—the “program logic”—in the results chain: inputs, processes, outputs (including coverage or “reach” across beneficiary groups), outcomes, and impact. It leads to the identification of indicators at each stage in this chain, as well as risks which might impede the attainment of the objectives. The LogFrame is also a vehicle for engaging partners in clarifying objectives and designing activities. During implementation, the LogFrame serves as a useful tool to review progress and take corrective action.

**Theory-Based Evaluation.** Theory-based evaluation has similarities to the LogFrame approach but allows a much more in-depth understanding of the workings of a program or activity—the “program theory” or “program logic.” In particular, it needs not assume simple linear cause-and effect relationships. For example, the success of a government program to improve literacy levels by increasing the number of teachers might depend on a large number of factors. These include, among others, availability of classrooms and textbooks, the likely reactions of parents, school principals and schoolchildren, the skills and morale of teachers, the districts in
where the extra teachers are to be located, the reliability of government funding, and so on. By mapping out the determining or causal factors judged important for success, and how they might interact, it can then be decided which steps should be monitored as the program develops, to see how well they are in fact borne out. This allows the critical success factors to be identified. And where the data show these factors have not been achieved, a reasonable conclusion is that the program is less likely to be successful in achieving its objectives.

**Cost-Benefit and Cost-Effectiveness Analysis.** Cost-benefit and cost-effectiveness analysis are tools for assessing whether or not the costs of an activity can be justified by the outcomes and impacts. Cost-benefit analysis measures both inputs and outputs in monetary terms. Cost-effectiveness analysis estimates inputs in monetary terms and outcomes in non-monetary quantitative terms (such as improvements in student reading scores).

**Impact Evaluation.** Impact evaluation is the systematic identification of the effects – positive or negative, intended or not – on individual households, institutions, and the environment caused by a given development activity. Impact evaluation helps us better understand the extent to which activities reach the poor and the magnitude of their effects on people’s welfare. Impact evaluations can range from large scale sample surveys in which project populations and control groups are compared before and after, and possibly at several points during program intervention; to small-scale rapid assessment and participatory appraisals where estimates of impact are obtained from combining group interviews, key informants, case studies and available secondary data.

### 3. M&E at Various Levels

**CAS.** The goal of any project designed in developing countries by the World Bank has to follow the Country Assistance Strategy (CAS), a document developed by staff and client countries, which defines high level development goals and priorities for the country. The CAS includes several strategic or program goals. For cultural heritage, the goal stated in the CAS could be defined as “achieving local economic development by maximizing benefits from a country’s cultural heritage assets.” Projects, in practice, are tools to implement the CAS.

**PDO and Outcomes.** Each project has a Project Development Objective (PDO), stated in the Project Appraisal Document (PAD), which is prepared by staff during project design, in close consultation with client countries. The PDO is the main outcome of the project and is definable by the change in beneficiary behavior, systems, or institutional performance. The PDO is linked to corresponding outcomes. Outcomes are defined as the results of a successfully implemented PDO. In a cultural heritage project, a sample PDO could be “an organized and managed system of conserved and sustained cultural heritage,” while the outcome indicator can be a percentage indicating the “increase in cultural heritage-related permanent jobs,” or “increase in residents’ satisfaction for improved service delivery.”
**Project components and Outputs.** In order to achieve the PDO, the project features various project components, which correspond to outputs. Project components are used to hold the project accountable to its promises. Project components are a set of clearly defined activities necessary to execute the project successfully and achieve the PDO. They provide a detailed project implementation plan, which helps to break down a given project, and are connected with outputs. Components also demonstrate what portion of the project budget is allocated for each output. Main characteristics of successful component design are a clear timeframe, comprehensiveness, integrated systems, and client-centered design. This means that components, and therefore outputs, need to be comprehensive set of demand-driven constituents outlined in a reasonable timeframe. An example of components in a cultural heritage project can be “establishment of a separate entity responsible for cultural heritage conservation,” “creation of an inventory of architecturally and historically significant structures in the historic city,” or “conservation of key cultural heritage assets.” Output indicators, respectively, can be “establishment of a regulatory framework for conservation,” “number of listed buildings,” or “number of conserved buildings.”

**M&E Matrix.** The framework of a typical M&E analysis at the World Bank can be outlined in a 4x4 matrix. The first column of the matrix includes the CAS goal, PDO, and project components. The second column conveys the indicators responding to each constituent. The third column, M&E, is a definite system for monitoring and evaluation, and the fourth column includes risk and assumptions regarding the environment the project is implemented in. This column is necessary because most World Bank projects are implemented in conditions of uncertainty and therefore a moderate to high risk exists to the project cycle. An example of the matrix is shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituents</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>M&amp;E</th>
<th>Risks &amp; Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country Assistance Strategy (CAS) Goals</td>
<td>Program performance indicators.</td>
<td>Program evaluation system needs to be set up.</td>
<td>Risks regarding strategic impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Development Objective (PDO)</td>
<td>Outcome indicators, impact assessment, return on the investment.</td>
<td>Client, community, processes, and sources of data needed for an effective project evaluation system.</td>
<td>Risks regarding program level impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project components</td>
<td>Output indicators, tangible project results.</td>
<td>Monitoring system needs to be established at the early stage of project design. Outputs established and monitored.</td>
<td>Risks regarding implementation and efficiency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1| The M&E matrix*
4. Case Study: Shandong Confucius and Mencius Cultural Heritage Conservation and Development Project

A Project Focusing on Two Historic Cities of Global Significance. The recent cultural heritage project in Shandong (China), which is scheduled for Board Approval in May 2011, is selected as a case study to demonstrate World Bank’s M&E methodology in cultural heritage projects. Shandong, a province in eastern China is home to the cities of Qufu and Zoucheng, where Confucius and Mencius—two prominent philosophers—lived. UNESCO recognized the temple, cemetery, and family mansion of Confucius in Qufu as World Heritage Sites in 1994, while a number of other assets in the two cities, which are included in the World Bank-financed project, are on the World Heritage Tentative List. While Shandong counts on large enterprises in manufacturing industry as its main engine of economic growth, the provincial authorities are committed to promoting economic diversification and developing heritage-based tourism.

The Two Historic Cities Have Assets of Immense Value, yet They Are Unattractive. Despite the invaluable cultural heritage assets, historic cities of Qufu and Zoucheng have poor living standards for local residents and are unattractive to city internal and external users, meaning local resident and tourists. Many of the historic structures are under risk of collapse due to structural weaknesses and there is not adequate signage and display to facilitate visitor orientation and appreciation. In spite of these problems, a steady growth in the number of tourists is evident. However, the average length of stay for tourists in both cities is less than a day, a result of poor cultural heritage management and tourism planning.

These Assets Can Be Leveraged for Local Economic Development. Within this context, the World Bank got involved in development of historic assets of Shandong, because of its worldwide experience in leveraging historic city regeneration, cultural heritage conservation, and sustainable tourism development as tools for local economic development. The World Bank—as a poverty alleviation organization—includes in its agenda, conservation, and development of historic cities, where the poor and marginalized citizens generally reside. It is proven that effective management of cultural and natural assets of a community contributes to local economic development and improves livelihood and social cohesion.

Goal, PDO, Components. The goal of the project on a larger scale is to boost local economic development by leveraging cultural heritage assets. This US$130 million project, to which the World Bank contributes with a soft loan of US$50 million, has been designed with the Project Development Objective of “assisting Shandong Province to enhance cultural heritage conservation and tourism management in Qufu and Zoucheng”. The PDO and outcome indicators are listed in Table 2. Project components and output indicators are listed in Table 3.
Table 2 | PDO and outcome indicators of the Shandong cultural heritage project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PDO</th>
<th>Outcome Indicators</th>
<th>Use of Monitoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Assist Shandong Province to enhance cultural heritage conservation and tourism management in Qufu and Zoucheng. | • Average per capita income of residents in project areas out of tourism activities.  
• Average expenditure of visitors.  
• % of visitors that stay over 1 day.  
• Number of cultural heritage sites pending conservation.  
• % of local residents with access to improved urban services. | Feed into government’s strategy to enhance and sustain cultural heritage conservation. |

Table 3 | Components and output indicators of the Shandong cultural heritage project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Output Indicators</th>
<th>Use of Monitoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Component A  
Physical conservation and adaptive reuse of cultural heritage assets. | • Number of cultural heritage assets adaptively reused.  
• % of visitors satisfied with heritage presentation and interpretation. | Gauge implementation progress and adjust plans and management to address problems, possible delays and design issues. |
| Component B  
Historic city regeneration and infrastructure upgrading. | • % of residents satisfied with the historic city upgrading.  
• Level of visitors’ satisfaction with historic cities and scenic areas. | Gauge implementation progress and adjust plans and management to address problems, possible delays and design issues. |
| Component C  
Community participation. | • % of visitors satisfied with quality of souvenirs and services by local residents.  
• Adoption of development control handbook and development plan formulated under the project. | Low levels may flag either poor program design or quality of the technical assistance commissioned. |
| Component D  
Capacity building and project management. | • % of trainees applied the knowledge learnt in their daily work.  
• % of visitors satisfied with management of heritage sites and scenic areas. | Low levels may flag either poor training program or quality of the technical assistance commissioned. |

5. Conclusion

M&E is a highly cost-effective tool for improving development activities management and for supporting decisions in government resource allocation. It should be focused on results, meaning on outcomes and impacts, rather than inputs or outputs. M&E is based on a sound set of indicators, with detailed data collection. A contribution towards a comprehensive approach to M&E is exhibited in the Shandong cultural heritage project, within the World Bank’s M&E framework. It is an M&E system embedded in the process of project design and
implementation and not only translates the cultural values into measurable data, but also allows demonstrating how cultural heritage conservation can be leveraged as asset-based approach to local economic development.
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