



# European Commission's practice

## Result Oriented Monitoring

(Slides prepared by SOGREAH Asia Monitoring  
Team, 2006)



EUROPEAN COMMISSION  
External Relations



Delegation of the European Commission to India, Bhutan and Nepal  
[www.delind.ec.europa.eu](http://www.delind.ec.europa.eu)

## Some definitions

**Monitoring:** The regular checking of progress by managers to rapidly identify and manage problems and successes requiring information of maximum precision and optimal ignorance

**Evaluation:** The detailed study of the mechanics of why and how something is working or not working by “experts”

**Results oriented monitoring:** In terms of external cooperation or development this is a hybrid between monitoring and evaluation as some “results” are simple and others complex.



# Monitoring Report



**MONITORING REPORT**  
**SOMALIA – SOM – 2<sup>nd</sup> REHABILITATION PROGRAMME: RURAL**  
**WATER SUPPLY.**  
**MR-00226.01 – 25/06/01**

## I. PROJECT DATA

Project Number: <b>6 ACP SO 89</b>	Task Manager: <b>Managed by Delegation</b>
Date Financing Agreement signed: <b>15/07/99</b>	Delegation Advisor: <b>Christop Langenkamp</b>
Start date – planned: <b>01/10/99</b>	Monitor: <b>Richard Platt/John Clifton</b>
Start date – actual: <b>16/02/00</b>	Project Authority: <b>Foundation Caritas Luxembourg</b>
End date – planned: <b>30/10/01</b>	Sector/Subsector: <b>16340 – Reconstruction Relief</b>
End date – likely: <b>16/04/02</b>	Monitoring visit date: <b>From : 14/05/01 - To: 31/05/01</b>

## II. FINANCIAL DATA\*

Primary commitment (project budget):	€ <b>35796714</b>
Secondary Commitment (funds contracted):	€ <b>995000</b>
Funds Disbursed by the Commission:	€ <b>379464</b>
Expenditure Incurred by Project:	€ <b>219606</b>

\* As at: 06/03/01

## III. SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

1. Relevance and quality of design	c
2. Efficiency of implementation to date	c
3. Effectiveness to date	c
4. Impact to date	c
5. Potential sustainability	c

Note: a = very good; b = good; c = problems; d = serious deficiencies

## IV. EXPLANATORY COMMENTS

### 1. Relevance and quality of design.

This report relates only to contract no. 78 (288-NGO-W08-99) within the 2<sup>nd</sup> Rehabilitation Programme (6 ACP SO 89). The project proposal was prepared using data obtained from previous similar projects and from a rural water needs assessment. The original logframe was however, poorly constructed and subsequently modified at the start of implementation. Despite this, the revised logframe is also poorly constructed with five stated overall objectives and many OVI's which are vaguely worded and for which little consideration has been given as to how the information might be gathered. There is no base line data against which many of the OVI's can be assessed. The project purpose is more precisely worded in terms of 'people trained in water usage, better access to sustainable water, and improved management and maintenance systems', though it fails to incorporate reference to improved health and sanitation which are important components of the project. Activities described and the project results are relevant in terms of achieving the purpose. Various amendments have been made to the activities in terms of the emphasis placed on the different works packages (e.g. increased Berkad - sunken tanks - rehabilitation) reflecting the projects ability to adapt well to changing circumstances.

### 2. Efficiency of implementation to date.

The project start up was delayed due to difficulty in recruiting a suitable project engineer. Implementation is now behind schedule with only 10% of works completed at month 13 of 24. Unit costs are within original budget costs and the quality of construction appears good. Unplanned problems have occurred in developing community commitment to sub-surface dams which has resulted in this aspect falling well behind programme. It is thus unlikely that all the dams will be constructed within the contract duration. Other findings have led to activities being removed from the project altogether. Other NGO's are implementing similar a project with different methodology. OXFAM have a revolving loan fund to support community rehabilitation of Berkads. The merits of the differing approaches has not been closely examined, though the newly created NGO forum should address this and develop standard or best practice. Sanitation awareness activities have only recently commenced in the communities and it is too early to observe any significant results. The project has been successful in bringing together other organisations involved in Water and

Sanitation (WATSAN) activities and have introduced a common methodology.

### 3. Effectiveness to date.

Since rehabilitation work has only recently been completed it is too early to comment as to how effective they will be in achieving the objectives. Initially the concept was to enable the poorest groups to have access to clean water supplies. With the changes in the project design, it is now private family Berkads which are being rehabilitated and thus the poorest, who don't own a Berkad are still expected to have to pay for water during the dry months. The benefit to them is that they might now have shorter distances to transport their water. However, no monitoring or baseline data has been collected to verify this point. The problem of the subsurface dams and the communities decision not to cooperate may in part be due to a failure of the NGO's to communicate the expected benefits or that the benefits are not perceived as being significant (in terms of the required contribution) by the community.

### 4. Impact to date.

The project is implementing the activities in both the rehabilitation of water supplies and the sanitation awareness training. These two combined activities are likely to assist in achieving the overall objectives of better health and sufficient water supply within the communities targeted under the project. Agricultural production is unlikely to increase unless additional activities (not included in the project) for improved agricultural practice and irrigation are also undertaken.

### 5. Potential sustainability.

It has not yet been proven that the skills and improved technology in Berkad rehabilitation using ferro-cement techniques have been adopted by the communities, since none have yet attempted to increase the number of Berkads rehabilitated beyond those done by the LNGO within the project. Improvements in health will only occur when accompanied by improved sanitation practice and these have only recently started in the communities. It is however, expected that the combined activities will improve the health and welfare of rural communities. The benefits of subsurface dams need to be demonstrated to ensure support and participation. In addition greater understanding of the reasons for lack of participation in first location is needed along with improved knowledge of likely environmental impact of these dams if adopted on a large scale. There is evidence of poor communication between the Ministry of Water and the INGO, this appears in part to be a culture/gender issue which might be improved with some assistance from an external specialist. In addition, the Ministry is unclear about its role and responsibilities, leading them to request support for inappropriate activities. The local NGO's participating in the programme are developing strong technical skills however, the management development activities have been less structured. Since most LINGO's work with more than just the one INGO, a joint approach is required for any development. There is evidence of good co-operation between the INGOs and some shared training activities have already commenced.

## V. KEY OBSERVATIONS, ACTION(S) RECOMMENDED AND BY WHOM (IN ORDER OF PRIORITY)

- The reasons behind the lack of community willingness to participate in sub-surface dams needs to be understood more fully in order for the project to successfully redesign its strategy and implement other dams. (Caritas)
- Revised implementation chart to be developed with budget requirements and cashflow forecasts indicating how the project will be completed assuming the extension of time is granted. (Caritas)
- A detailed study be undertaken before the end of 2001, to appraise the strengths and weaknesses of the differing approaches to WATSAN in the region. Study to include: cost effectiveness, efficiency, development of skills in community, adoption of improved technology, performance, sustainability. (EC TA)
- Develop baseline data and commence internal monitoring of project. (Caritas)
- A more transparent approach to the selection of locations for project intervention should be developed, preferably with reference to other INGO's and the Ministry of Water to develop more rational approach. (Caritas/ LINGO's/Ministry of Water)
- Needs assessment of LINGO partners to develop structure management development programme.
- Future needs assessment of the Ministry be carried out to determine what support they need and how it can be delivered. This might include training in the functions of national planning, development of water resource management strategies, policy and aid coordination. (EC TA/ Ministry of Water/Caritas)
- Gender and culture awareness training be given to both INGO's and the Ministry to attempt to improve the level of understanding, communication and cooperation. (EC TA/ Caritas/Ministry of Water)
- Investigate establishing a local cottage industry to produce wire mesh in Hargeisa. (Caritas/INGO's)



# Summary of Conclusion

↑	a.	The project is very good, fully according to or better than to plan. There is every indication that it will achieve its Purpose and Objectives.
	b.	This is a good project, broadly progressing as planned. <u>But</u> certain corrective measures are required if the project is to fully reach its Purpose and Objectives.
<p>→                      ↓                      ←</p> <p><b>ON TARGET/AS PLANNED</b></p> <p>↑</p>		
↓	c.	The project has problems. Without corrective measures it will <u>not</u> meet its Purpose and Objectives.
	d.	The project has serious deficiencies. Either substantial corrective measures, major redesign or termination of the project is necessary.



## Simple and complicated questions in ROM

- Is the intervention currently efficient?
- Is the intervention currently effective?
- Will the intervention have impact given current evidence?
- Will the intervention be sustainable given current evidence?
- Is the design currently good in terms of realism, clarity and coherence etc?
- Is the design currently relevant?



## Pre-requisites for ROM to be effective

These include:

- All parties accept and understand the central role, potentials and limitations of logical frameworks
- All parties play an active, timely and transparent part in the monitoring process and its follow up
- De-concentration with associated human resource development and protocol development empowers improvement in policy program and intervention design and management at all levels
- Workable financial and contractual regulations and procedures
- Good quality monitors



## Structural Limitations of ROM

ROM identifies key issues in an intervention at a particular time by a particular group of people using a limited time, set of documents and visits. It cannot therefore be used to resolve such questions such as

- Is this a good intervention?
- Has the intervention improved overall?
- What is the most effective sector?
- What is the most effective country?
- What is the most effective scale of intervention eg small NGO or large bilateral?
- What is the most effective type of intervention; eg development, economic cooperation, project or sector etc?
- What has happened after the project has finished?

