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Qualities of Indicators

Clear : Precise and unambiguous
Relevant : Appropriate to the set goal
Economic : Available or computable with reasonable cost
Adequate : Provides sufficient basis to access performance
Measurable : Quantifiable
Qualities of Indicators

S : Specific
M : Measurable
A : Attainable
R : Realistic
T : Time bound

These should lead to a results-based system of Monitoring and Evaluation
Key Actors in Governance

- **State**: Creating a favourable political, legal & economic environment
- **Market**: Creating opportunities for People
- **Civil Society**: Mobilising peoples’ participation

Mobilising peoples’ participation
Case Study: Five Dimensions of Governance

1. Political
   - Nature of political contestation, conduct of political players, use & abuse of political authority, citizen’s faith in the political system
   - Ability of the state to manage its resources

2. Administrative
   - Ability of the state to maintain law & order, safeguard human rights, enable access & delivery of justice

3. Legal & Judicial
   - Ability of the state to manage its resources

4. Economic
   - Ability of the state to create conducive climate for business and ensure macro-economic stability

5. Social
   - Ability of the state to take care of the vulnerable; vibrant civil society, and environmental management
# Scrutiny & Validation of Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governance Dimension</th>
<th>No. of Indicators</th>
<th>In the Initial Indicator Framework</th>
<th>Retained after testing</th>
<th>Deleted after testing</th>
<th>Modified/merged after testing</th>
<th>Newly added after testing</th>
<th>In the Final Framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal/ Judicial</td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>271</strong></td>
<td><strong>117</strong></td>
<td><strong>109</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>164</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Approach for validation

Quality of Indicators to be validated by

a) Field Testing
b) Inputs from various stakeholders including
   • Different groups of stakeholders
   • Common people
   • Experts and
   • Experienced professionals
## Modifying or Deleting an Indicator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension of Governance</th>
<th>Indicator under validation</th>
<th>Source of data</th>
<th>Action taken</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>Proportion of bogus voters in the electoral list</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Deleted</td>
<td>Found difficult to ascertain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of women candidates fielded in election</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Deleted</td>
<td>Outcome i.e. proportion of women elected is not captured by this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>Proportion of women in government service in senior cadres</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Modified</td>
<td>Modified as: ‘Aggregate proportion of women in government service.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of the government budget earmarked for women</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Deleted</td>
<td>Difficult to collect information as gender budgeting is not done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Percent of habitations not having primary school within one kilometer</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Modified</td>
<td>Percent of parents who say that the primary school is not easily accessible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tools to improve M&E systems using stakeholders participation

- Community Score Cards
- Citizen Report Cards
- Social Audits
- Participatory Expenditure Tracking, Planning and Budgeting
Community Score Card

- Centre for Good Governance developed Community Score Cards in Health service provision and School Education
- Used by community as a basic unit of analysis
- Focus on monitoring Public Services at gross root level
- Generate information through focus group interaction
- Participatory and feedback oriented
- Joint decision on quality of service and indicators between recipients and service providers
- Empowers community and promote good governance
- Tried successfully in Zambia, Malawi and Ghana, and India
Participatory Programme Evaluation (Community Score Cards)

- CSC is a participatory method of evaluation by all stakeholders
- Community evaluates with Self-evaluation by service providers
- Interface meeting is held with community and service providers
- Citizen performance reviews serve as feedback to improve
Process in developing community score cards

1. Preparatory Groundwork
2. Community Gathering
   - Input Tracing Score Cards
   - Self Evaluation by Service Provider
   - Community generated performance Scorecards
3. Interface Meeting
4. Reforms
Community Score Card

- Preparatory ground work
- Input tracking, sharing information, verifying record, comparing supply side data and finalizing the indicators
- Performance Score Card by the community – the scoring is done by community in the given format
- Self evaluation by service provider – giving scores
- Interface meeting and action planning – Feedback is given on evaluation of the score cards
- Institutionalization – following up a repeating score card with benchmark data
- Finally the community action plan has indicators given by the service providers as well as community to arrive at a consensus with mutual agreement.
Citizen Report Cards

• Can be used by Local, Provincial or National services

• Common services like Health, Water supply, Utility etc.

• Rating scales are provided

• Helps in Citizen engagement and empowerment in monitoring process
Performance Tracking & Evaluation using citizen report cards

Citizen Report Cards
Pioneered in India by Public Affairs Centre, Bangalore

- Obtain citizen feedback on service delivery through sample surveys
- Benchmark and compare the performance:
  - across departments/service providers
  - over a time period
Participatory Monitoring & Evaluation in civic infrastructure

- Community is mobilized to check the records to see the progress of work and compare with the schedule of project
- Community can make an evaluation of whether work was done to the satisfactory levels of quality.
Social Audit

• Unique mechanism for creating social accounts with the help of community

• Mandatory in programs like ‘National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme’ (NREGS) in India

• Social Auditors recruited from the community

• Social Audit findings discussed in open public meetings attended by all stakeholders

• Brings quality to the indicators and tools of measurement
Case study - Social Audit in Rural Employment Scheme of India

• Flagship program of Government of India with $ 8 billion per year providing wage employment of 100 days to rural poor.

• Two day long training for volunteers for village audit team

• Disclosure of information to the wage seekers under the Right to Information Act and give them access to muster rolls, pay orders, measurement books of civil works, engineering cost estimates etc.

• Two day training for five volunteers for village audit team.

• Verification on ground with official records to conduct social audit over a period of four days in a village.

• Hosting the public hearings in the presence of all officials and stakeholders to discuss the findings of social audit.

• Take immediate remedial action in case of irregularities.
Social Audit

- **Develop measurable indicators for process & outcome** in consultation with the stakeholders
- Develop **forms & formats for consolidation** of information
- **Consultation with the community** and the beneficiaries for verifying the information
- **Gap Identification & listing issues** for public hearing
- Assess the **preparedness** of Public Agencies in disclosing information
- Organize **public hearings**
- Record **resolutions for corrective action**
What succeeds

• Civil engagement is bringing success in M&E
• Citizen – Government dialogue should improve
  – Citizen’s Charters
  – Grievance redress mechanism
  – Participatory mechanisms
  – Right to Information
• Social Accountability as a State control on the actions of service providers
• Bottom up in nature
• E-Government systems help
Danger of poor quality of information for decision making

• Results in poor targeting of expenditure for plans and schemes
• Leads to corruption and linkages in the system
• Appropriation of subsidy and government assistance by undeserving people
• Wasteful expenditure
• Monitoring of unimportant items at the cost of important works
Right to Information Act – Indian example

Challenges:

• lack of adequate and effective record management
• Resistance of bureaucracy to part with the information
• Ignorance of people of procedures to access information
• Lack of training

Strong Points:

• System of Penalty and punishment in case of denial of information
• Strong set up of Indian Government organizations
Some other Country examples on information disclosure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Ombudsman system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>System of Appeal to Information disclosure board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Provision for judicial review in case of denial of information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Very sound information regime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>Whistle blower protection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Structure of the Government M&E System in India

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

Central System

Planning Commission
- PA&M Div.
- PEO
- PO&RM Div.
- CGOOM
- DEAC
- Plan Speed Group

Audit & Accounts System
- Controller General of Acc
- Comptroller & Auditor General

Ministry of Statistics & Programme Implementation (MoSPI)
- Statistics Wing
- CSO
- NSSO

Program Implementation
- 20 Points Program
- Infrastructure Monitoring
- Project Monitoring
- MPLADS

IT System
- NICNET

Research Institutes
- IIPA
- NIRD
- ICSSR
- Others

Civil Society Organizations
- NGOs
- Media
- Individuals

State System

State Planning Boards
- SEOs
- Planning Department

Dept of Stats & Econ
- Statistical Bureaus
- Bureau of Economics & Statistics
- Directorates/Boards of Statistics

CGOOM – Core Group on Overview of Outcome Monitoring
DEAC – Development Evaluation Advisory Committee
IIPA – Indian Institute of Public Administration
PA&M – Project Appraisal & Management Division
PEO – Programme Evaluation Organization
PO&RM – Programme Outcome & Response Monitoring Division
SEO – State Evaluation Organization
NIRD is supported by a system of state level institutes of rural development (SIRDs)
M&E Institutional Framework in India

1. Planning Commission
2. Ministry of Programme Implementation and Statistics
3. Comptroller and Auditor General
4. Decennial Census
5. Periodic rounds of National Sample Survey Organization
6. Budget reports of Federal, State and Local Government
7. Websites of different departments and ministries
8. Pro-active disclosure under Right to Information Act
Limitations of Indian system

• It is top-driven macro management system
• Information at gross root is not organized so effectively
• Resistance of officials to give away information
• Inadequate record keeping
• Citizen involvement can improve quality of data and resultant information with Social Accountability tools
Some positive trends in India

• Increase in the use of e-Governance for G-C (Government – Citizen) dialogue

• Electronic data repository

• Social accountability mechanism such as social audit being institutionalized in programme implementation

• Large number of public authorities and public information officers

• Increased awareness of Right to Information

• Pro-active websites of Departments and Ministries
Groups in Civic Engagement - Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Transport | • Road User Groups  
                   • Transport Associations     |
| Water    | • Water User Associations  
                   • Distributor Committees  
                   • Project Implementation Committees  
                   • Project Monitoring Units |
| Energy   | • Agricultural Energy Users  
                   • Consumer’s Associations  
                   • Industrial Energy Users  
                   • Public Service Providers |
| Urban    | • Self Help Groups/Neighbourhood Groups  
                   • Community Development Societies  
                   • Ward & Wards’ Committees     |

Community, Beneficiaries, Project Affected Persons, NGOs and Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) are involved across all sectors.
Proactive ‘Right to Information’ Regime in India

- Very comprehensive Right to Information Act
- Information Commissions at federal and state levels
- Penalty on public officials for failure to give information
- Provision for proactive disclosure
- Call centers for taking request for information
- Strong civil society
- State funding for training and awareness building
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