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Ministry of Plan Implementation

- **Mission:**
  To function as the National Focal Point for **Monitoring and Evaluation** of all Government Development Programmes, Projects and Policies to ensure results and **achievement of development objectives**.

- **Institutions:**
  Department of Foreign Aid and Budget Monitoring (DFABM)
  National Operations Room (NOR)

- **Website:**
Features of M&E

• Monitoring Capital Budget of Line Ministries.
• Monitoring Projects Over Rs. 50 Million.
• Submission of Quarterly Report to the Cabinet of Ministers on Progress of Development Projects.
• Maintaining the Electronic Project Monitoring System.
• Holding trouble shooting meetings to resolve implementation issue.
Features of M&E cont..

- Institutionalize Managing for Development Results in Government.
- Programme/Project Evaluation.
- Joint Evaluation/ Outsourcing of Evaluations.
- Manage Evaluation Information System.
- Monitoring and Evaluation Capacity Development.
ADB TA in 1991 to establish Post Evaluation Unit

- Introduction of methodology, techniques, procedures for PE (manuals and guidelines)
- On the job training of senior government officials
- Sensitization of policy makers and senior government officials
- Dissemination of evaluation findings and establishment of feedback arrangements
- Development of Computerized Evaluation Information System (EIS) for storing and retrieving Post Evaluation Findings
- Introduced Evaluation Module in SLIDA to orient government officials
DEVELOPMENT EVALUATION

- On-going, Ex-Post and Impact Evaluation
- Outsourcing Evaluations
- Joint Evaluations
- Evaluation of the Implementation of PD
- Dissemination and Feedback - EIS
- Project Submission Format Captures Evaluation Lessons
- SLEVA – enhancement of evaluation culture
Criteria's used for selecting projects for evaluation

As Evaluation is an expensive exercise it is necessary to carefully select projects for evaluation.

- Projects that are likely to be replicated.
- Projects of an innovative nature or unusual nature where feedback is sought.
- Project that may be running into problems (decision to terminate or re-adjust).
- Projects which may throw light on new or upcoming policy initiatives.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Rating Description</th>
<th>Rating Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Relevance</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Highly Relevant</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Relevant</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Partly Relevant</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Efficacy</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>Highly Efficacious</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Efficacious</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less Efficacious</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inefficacious</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Efficiency</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Highly Efficient</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Efficient</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less Efficient</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inefficient</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sustainability</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Most likely</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less Likely</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Institutional Development and Other Impact</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Assessment (Weighted average of A1, A2, A3, B and C)

Highly successful (HS): Overall weighted average (OWA) is > 2.5 and none of the 5 criteria has a score of less than 2; Successful (S): OWA is between $1.6 \leq S \leq 2.5$ and none of the 5 criteria has a score of less than 1; Partly Successful (PS): OWA is between $0.6 \leq PS \leq 1.6$ and number of criteria receiving a rating of less than 1 should not exceed 2; Unsuccessful (US): OWA is less than 0.6.
Evaluation Information System (EIS) – to support evidenced based decision making and learning

- A Data Base of Evaluation Report is being established in the MPI
- Inability to access evaluation information of projects is a key problem.
- Online access to project wise synopsis (one page summary) and sector wise synthesis and high level abstraction to busy senior officials
- Integrate lessons into planning, budgeting, policy process and project formulation (Avoid repetition of past mistakes)
- Single Evaluation findings unlikely to be acted. Translates technical findings into policy
Without planned and managed cascading process the MfDR created at the highest level are unlikely to impact upon the living condition of the poor.
INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF MANAGING FOR DEVELOPMENT RESULTS

Strategic Approach

- MfDR Core Group was appointed to guide and direct the preparation of strategy and work programme (Champion)

- Plan of Action

- Orientation Programme on MfDR (RBM) for all Senior Govt. Officials


- Piloting and Mainstreaming
  - Pilot Phase with 5 line Ministries
  - 35 Ministries ARFs developed
  - Scoring of results against identified KPI commenced by Ministries
INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF MANAGING FOR DEVELOPMENT RESULTS

Operational Strategy

- **Steering Committees** of the Line Ministries to assume ownership (*Change Agents*)
- **Consultation in Development of Agency Results Framework** (ARF)
  - Basis
    - Ten Year National Development Framework including MDGs
    - Sector Plans
    - Mandate of the Ministry
  - Consultation meetings with Ministry and its Departments / Agencies
  - Endorsed through Stakeholder Consultation meetings
- All ARFs and **Scorecards** of Ministries are placed in the **MPI Web Platform**
- **CoP on MfDR**: Face to Face Peer to Peer learning and sharing of experience
Operational Strategy (Contd.)

- **Sequential Steps** followed

  - Setting Clear Objectives (**Vision, Mission, Thrust Areas**)
  - Translating Objectives into measurable **Goals** and **Targets** using **Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)**
  - Measuring and reporting on Results
  - Evaluation of Performance – Why?
  - Feedback to improve Programmes and Projects
Managing for Results

Performance measures assess progress.

Where are we now?

Analysis

Goals

Where do we want to go?

Action

How do we get there?

How did we do?

Performance Measures

15,000 ft view
Development of a Replicable Model (Not re-inventing the wheel)

  - Oregon Benchmarks.
  - Minnesota Milestones.
  - Virginia Scorecard

- Reviewed the Canadian Model.
- Localized to country context..
LINKING MfDR TO NATIONAL BUDGET

Budget Call 2010

- **Results Based Budgeting** in the Public Sector, Department of National Budget, Ministry of Finance and Planning
- MfDR Initiative of the MPI be linked to annual Budget Process
- Use ARF with **KPIs to justify budgetary provisions**
- KPIs to use “output” as well as “outcome” indicators
- Officials of **MPI, National Budget Department** and **National Planning Department** conducted **joint meetings** with 35 line Ministries to guide the implementation of Budget Call 2010 on MfDR.
- National Workshop held to orient over 20 line Ministries on linking MfDR to National Budgeting (Performance Budgeting) to comply with the Budget Call 2010
## Managing for Development Results

### Results Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Thrust Area</th>
<th>KPIs</th>
<th>Relevant Budget Link (Vote Particulars)</th>
<th>Budgetary Provision for 2010 (Rs. Mn.)</th>
<th>Base year Achievement of KPIs 2008</th>
<th>Target of KPIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Sri Lanka, the Department of National Budget under its budget instructions directs all Executing Agencies to develop 5 to 6 key performance measures that will be used to evaluate the success in achieving the Agency's Mission and objectives and indicate the desired direction of change. Too many targets mean unclear priority.

Outcomes and impacts are not only difficult to measure but even more difficult to attribute.
Discussions held with Auditor General, to integrate MfDR into National Audits (Performance Audits).

Lead to a Shift in focus from compliance audit to value for money audit

Discussions are to be held with the Department of State Accounts to facilitate MfDR initiative in Appropriation Accounts.

Administrative Reforms have embraced MfDR as an important National Reform initiative (NARC).

MfDR included in the PIM and SLIDA curriculum.
LESSONS LEARNT: MAKING CHANGE MANAGEMENT WORK

1. Political will and Political environment – **Govt. Policy on MfDR**
2. **Champions** to lead the change management process
3. **Leadership at different levels** of Government (Change Agent)
4. MfDR **Strategy** and Action Plan
5. Adoption of a **process approach** – consensus building
6. **Buy-in** (LM, NBD, NPD, AG)
7. Country level **Community of Practice** to facilitate peer to peer dialogue
8. **Statistical** Information
9. **Capacity Building** and Readiness Assessment
Mainstreaming MfDR: Overall Analysis of Readiness Assessment (ADB tool) (For a sample Institution)
1. **Attribution** limits the application of “Outcome Indicators”. E.g. Police Department – Crime Rates

2. **Unrealistic Expectation**: realistic expectations are vital but sometime lacking Eg: “No child left behind”.

3. The GPRA of 1993 did not fully achieve the expectation as there is “stick” but no “carrot”

4. Weak link between “Agency Performance” and “Individual Performance”
6. RBM Systems often overwhelmed Decision Makers with data – which they could not absorb. *(Information Overload).*

7. **Fear of being held accountable** for performance when cooperation and assistance outside the organization are necessary for success.

8. The most difficult aspect of good performance reporting is to identify and display those few pieces or performance information that tell the key element of the story, **keep it simple and smart** *(KISS).*
The Asia Pacific CoP-MfDR with over 25 countries visited Sri Lanka to see the emerging good practices on MfDR, in November 2008.

A study team from the Yemen Government led by the Deputy Minister of Planning and Economic Forecast, visited Sri Lanka to study the process adopted, October 2008.

The Canadian IPDET and IDEAS made a study visit to Sri Lanka to learn the MfDR initiative in February, 2009.

The current OECD Sourcebook 2008 recognizes the MfDR initiative in Sri Lanka, as an emerging good practice model.

The ADB sponsored Asia Pacific Regional Sourcebook on MfDR captures Sri Lankan MfDR case study as a replicable model.
What We Want to See is?

Results, Not Effort

The Perfect should not become the enemy of the good

- PD Evaluation 2008
Priority Action:

- Medium Term Predictability for Multi Year Planning and Budgeting.
- Use of country systems.
- Untied Aid to improve value for money.
- Mutually agreed conditionalities.
- Information sharing.

Managing for Development Results

- **Ownership**
  - Partners set the agenda

- **Alignment**
  - Aligning with partner’s agenda
  - Relying on partner’s systems

- **Harmonisation**
  - Establishing common arrangements
  - Simplifying procedures
  - Sharing information

MfDR AS AN OVERARCHING OBJECTIVE IN PARIS DECLARATION ON AID EFFECTIVENESS
AID EFFECTIVENESS INITIATIVES

• Localization of PD/AAA and prioritization of Country-based Action Plans

• Monitoring of the Aid Effectiveness Agenda (Aid Effectiveness Indicators)

• Evaluation of the Implementation of PD/AAA
Thank You.
Ministry of Highways and Road Development
Agency Results Framework

Vision
To provide accessibility and mobility to entire population of the country
by having high quality Highway network
for rapid, safe and comfort transportation of passengers and goods.

Mission
To develop and maintain best connected National Highway Network to provide
accessibility
to the entire population of the country.

Thrust Areas
1) Construction and Maintenance of Expressways
2) Improvement of National Highway Network
3) Bridge Rehabilitation and Reconstruction
4) Management of traffic congestion
5) Maintenance of National Highway Network
6) Capacity Building and Institutional Strengthening
7) Planning and Design
### Thrust Area 1: Construction and Maintenance of Expressways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Baseline 2007</th>
<th>2008 Target</th>
<th>2008 Actual</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faster accessibility and high mobility</td>
<td>Length of expressway completed and operated</td>
<td>Km</td>
<td>No expressway</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average speed of Expressway Network</td>
<td>Km/h</td>
<td>No expressway</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average usage of Expressway Network</td>
<td>Vehicle Km / day (in Millions)</td>
<td>No expressway</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Roughness of Expressway Network (Reflecting the VOC)</td>
<td>m/Km</td>
<td>No expressway</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Baseline 2007</td>
<td>2008 Target</td>
<td>2008 Actual</td>
<td>Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved Connectivity among regions</td>
<td>No. of Regional Growth Centres Connected</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of acceptable level of capacity and accessibility of the National Highway Network</td>
<td>Length of 6 lane roads in National Road Network</td>
<td>Km</td>
<td>15.84</td>
<td>15.84</td>
<td>15.84</td>
<td>15.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Length of 4 lane roads in National Road Network</td>
<td>Km</td>
<td>103.8</td>
<td>107.8</td>
<td>107.73</td>
<td>109.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Length of 2 lane roads in National Road Network</td>
<td>Km</td>
<td>4098.9</td>
<td>4162</td>
<td>4619</td>
<td>4444.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of length of road with V/C ratio &gt; 0.8</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average speed of highway network</td>
<td>Km/h</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Thrust Area 2: Improvement of National Highway Network

Cont..

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Baseline 2007</th>
<th>2008 Target</th>
<th>2008 Actual</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road user safety in the National Highway Network</td>
<td>▪ New provision of road sign and marking</td>
<td>Km</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>63.12</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Number of total road accidents per year</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>32458</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ No. of Black Spots (high accident locations) improved</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thrust Area 3: Bridges Rehabilitation and Reconstruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Baseline 2007</th>
<th>2008 Target</th>
<th>2008 Actual</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provision of acceptable level of capacity and accessibility of the National Highway Network</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>09 10 11 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Numbers of bridges newly rehabilitated or reconstructed

|       | | | | | 26 | 30 | 28 | 28 |
Thrust area 4: Management of Traffic Congestion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Baseline 2007</th>
<th>2008 Target</th>
<th>2008 Actual</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of traffic</td>
<td>Percentage of length of roads with V/C ratio &gt; 0.8</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>congestion</td>
<td>Number of grade separated junctions (Interchanges)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Flyovers constructed</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Pedestrian Under/Over passes Constructed</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of junctions signalized</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of junctions newly Improved</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Thrust area 5: Maintenance of National Highway Network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Baseline 2007</th>
<th>2008 Target</th>
<th>2008 Actual</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Well maintained National Highway Network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ No. of kms sand sealed (routine maintenance)</td>
<td>km/year</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ No. of kms surface treated (periodic maintenance)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Average Surface Distress Index (SDI)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Length of roads SDI &gt; 3 (Poor and Bad condition)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Length of roads IRI &gt; 5.5 (Fair, Poor and Bad condition)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Allocation for maintenance of roads &amp; bridges</td>
<td>Rs.</td>
<td>4500.0</td>
<td>4718.6</td>
<td>3530.0</td>
<td>4969.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5225.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5446.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5740.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Thrust area 5: Maintenance of National Highway Network

Cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Baseline 2007</th>
<th>2008 Target</th>
<th>2008 Actual</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of road user costs, in the NHN</td>
<td>Reduction of Average Vehicle Operating Cost</td>
<td>Rs./km/veh</td>
<td>15.15</td>
<td>15.10</td>
<td>15.04</td>
<td>14.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roughness Index (IRI) of roads ADT&lt;750</td>
<td>m/km</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.97</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roughness Index (IRI) of roads 750&lt;ADT&lt;2500</td>
<td>m/km</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7.59</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roughness Index (IRI) of roads 2500&lt;ADT&lt;10000</td>
<td>m/km</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roughness Index (IRI) of roads 10000&lt;ADT</td>
<td>m/km</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>