



# THE AFGHANISTAN RECONSTRUCTION TRUST FUND

Guidance Notes Series:

## Monitoring and Evaluation Framework

### THE AFGHANISTAN RECONSTRUCTION TRUST FUND Monitoring

All ARTF projects are implemented by government ministries and agencies. Government is therefore primarily responsible for monitoring project implementation and progress towards agreed project development objectives and results targets. The World Bank (WB) provides implementation support to the implementing agency and supervises progress and results.

Since the ARTF was established in Afghanistan in 2002, the supervision strategy for the country portfolio has evolved greatly in order to effectively execute the Bank's mandate, address the unique challenges in the country environment, and report to Government, the donor community, and stakeholders on results of ARTF financing.

Afghanistan's large portfolio necessitates diversified monitoring mechanisms due to the inclusion of large, high volume, complex projects with nationwide coverage being implemented in a low capacity, fragile state context.

ARTF projects are subject to WB policies which determines that Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) is carried-out through a combination of two mechanisms: i) Monitoring and self-evaluation, and ii) Independent evaluation.<sup>1</sup>

#### Box 1: ARTF M&E Approaches

Monitoring & Self-Evaluation	Project Results Frameworks
	Specific M&E approaches (including Third-Party Monitoring)
Independent Evaluations	Impact Evaluation
	Independent Evaluation

These mechanisms are therefore incorporated in all ARTF financed activities through M&E frameworks. At the project level, M&E frameworks are carried-out by Government and the Bank as follows:

**The Government** is primarily responsible for project design and implementation, which includes the design, monitoring and updating of the results framework, the establishment of adequate M&E arrangements, and reporting of progress and results.

**The World Bank** monitors and evaluates projects based on each project's M&E framework, relying on Government's M&E systems to collect data and information. The Bank evaluates the adequacy of government systems and ensures support for building capacity if systems need strengthening.

The Bank also works with ARTF donors to agree on the results expected from the ARTF overall and to harmonize monitoring, reporting, and evaluation requirements.

#### 1.1 Project M&E (Results) Frameworks

**Embedding Inputs, Outputs and Outcomes in all projects to ensure adequate monitoring and evaluation.**

A results framework represents the underlying logic that explains how the development objective of a project is to be achieved. It consists of three main elements: (a) the project development objectives; (b) a set of indicators to measure outcomes that are linked to the project development objective and a set of immediate results to track progress toward achieving outcomes; and (c) M&E arrangements specifying clear units of measurement for each indicator, baselines, annual and final targets for each indicator and roles and responsibilities for collecting, reporting, and analyzing data on those indicators.

<sup>1</sup> World Bank's Operational Policy 13.60 Monitoring and Evaluation

For each project, Government, in consultation with the Bank, develops a results framework outlining the expected outcomes that will achieve the Project Development Objective. This results framework is expected to be in place before a project is approved by the Bank. On the Bank's side, the project team is responsible for providing support project implementation, monitoring progress and conducting bi-annual reporting (through the Implementation Status and Results report).

## 1.2 Project M&E Approaches

### Implementing innovative M&E approaches to ensure access to data and overcome Afghanistan's security challenges.

ARTF Projects employ a variety of monitoring approaches and methods to track and report project progress. The following are some of the common approaches and methods used by the Government and the World Bank:

#### i. Community Monitoring

To ensure ownership and live feedback to the Government/line ministries, several projects make use of community monitoring (National Solidarity Program (NSP) and Education Quality Improvement (EQUIP) project), to monitor project implementation and report on project progress.



#### Community Participatory Monitoring (CPM) in the National Solidarity Project

After being piloted under the National Solidarity Program II in 2009, CMP has been scaled up to cover all NSP III project sites. Community monitor teams are comprised of two male and two female members elected by the community to monitor the quality and progress of NSP activities. CPMs undergo training to complete a simple checklist then report.

#### ii. Grievance Mechanisms

Projects include grievance mechanisms as part of the M&E system to ensure concerns on fraud and corruption, safeguards and other project related issues are communicated to the relevant authorities in a timely manner.

#### iii. Information and Communication Technology (ICT)

Several projects have been piloting the use of ICT to strengthen data collection and improve project progress reporting. Approaches vary in terms of the means of data collection (voice, SMS, electronic forms) and server-side components (databases, data reporting, and management interfaces). These choices relate to budget & resources, socioeconomic context (e.g. literacy, ability of users), and available technology services and infrastructure. One example is a pilot in the education sector, which tested the effectiveness of mobile telephones to enable the creation of citizen-feedback loops and to build the accountability of service delivery in education.

#### iv. Working with Partners

The Bank continues to engage with partners, including NGOs, to ensure exposure to innovative approaches to remote monitoring in challenging environments and to build on potential for cooperation on data collection, monitoring and reporting project results.

## 1.3 Evaluations

Independent evaluations of ARTF projects take two different tracks:

### i. Impact Evaluation

An impact evaluation (IE) establishes causality between the project's activities and its outcome, and is a tool used for measuring results and attribution. It estimates the impact of a particular project with clear causation, while removing confounding factors, by assessing changes brought about by the project interventions and activities. IEs aims at providing feedback to help improve the design of programs and policies, improved accountability, and is a tool for dynamic learning, allowing policy makers to improve ongoing programs.

Program IEs are carefully selected and not carried out for every project in the portfolio. IEs are financed by the ARTF Research and Analysis Program (RAP).

### ii. Independent Evaluation

Independent Evaluation validates self-evaluation activities, verifies their results, and/or undertakes separate assessments of the relevance, efficacy, and efficiency of Bank's operational activities and processes. The Bank's Independent Evaluation Group (IEG) (under the oversight of the Director-General, Evaluation, who reports directly to the Board), also does an independent evaluation of the project, and whether it has achieved its planned project development objective including the performance of the Bank and the Client.

### Access to Field Sites

The Bank had previously taken advantage of the physical presence of development partners outside of Kabul to undertake direct field supervision. However, with the winding down of PRTs, this is becoming increasingly difficult to do. The Bank has established a guest house in Mazar-e-Sharif to ensure access to project sites in Northern Afghanistan. The Bank makes use of third party monitoring and relies on government staff to monitor and report on progress from the field.



