

Matrix 2 – Key features of PRS Monitoring Systems in Africa

	Ethiopia	Ghana	Malawi	Mozambique	Rwanda	Tanzania	Uganda	Zambia
Key features of system	PRSP outlines a (primarily poverty) monitoring system. Not yet operational. Primarily poverty monitoring. PRSP monitoring system will build on existing poverty and welfare monitoring systems.	GRPS Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy (draft of October 2002). Not yet operational. Includes poverty monitoring, national M&E system and monitoring HIPC funds. Builds on existing Ghana Statistical Services as well as initiatives to strengthen routine data and expenditure tracking.	The National Monitoring and Evaluation Programme (Proposal of May 2002). Not yet operational. Includes (primarily) poverty monitoring and input monitoring. Emphasis in PRSP on no parallel systems. Formal monitoring system will be based on existing Poverty Monitoring System but strengthened by broader range of stakeholder involvement.	PARPA Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) system (established in December 2001). Not yet operational. PARPA Monitoring (includes poverty monitoring, monitoring of processes and sector results, and monitoring of inputs). A stronger coordination effort is intended for the PARPA monitoring (matrix and indicators) to be integrated further with the <i>Balanço do PES</i> .	PRSP outlines a monitoring plan. Not yet operational. In PRSP the M&E system focuses on poverty but includes performance assessment indicators. Recent workshop shows that the SPPMD will monitor both poverty impacts and PRS implementation. Poverty monitoring system will build on existing structures.	Poverty Monitoring Master Plan (PMMP) published in December 2001. Operational. Note PRSP also includes plans to track public expenditure. Emphasis is on capacity building and avoiding parallel systems.	Poverty Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy (PMES) published June 2002. Operational. PRSP outlines a monitoring system that includes poverty monitoring, outcomes monitoring and inputs monitoring. However, PMES is exclusively about poverty. Focuses firmly on strengthening existing government systems for monitoring and building accountability.	PRSP outlines a poverty monitoring and evaluation system. PRSP states that M&E of PRSP will complement already existing M&E instruments but these instruments will be tailored to monitor indicators selected in PRSP.
Details of institutional framework	System builds on existing Welfare Monitoring System Program which is supervised by the National Welfare Review Committee	M&E Division of the National Development Planning Commission will implement the M&E strategy, while the Ministry of Economic	National Economic Council is responsible for coordination and analysis. Four levels to rest of system: Cabinet Committee on the	Poverty and PARPA Observatory is committee for management and oversight of the PARPA M&E system. Consultative body	Poverty monitoring will be built into existing structures of data collection with some additional aspects. Role of SMMPD (still being firmed up)	Institutional structure had not been established in PRSP. PMMP sets out broad-based with terms of reference for various groups and committees	Poverty Monitoring and Analysis Unit of the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development, leads on coordination of	Planning and Economic Management Department in the Ministry of Finance and National Planning will be the focal point for

	Ethiopia	Ghana	Malawi	Mozambique	Rwanda	Tanzania	Uganda	Zambia
	<p>(comprised of ministers from key sectors).</p> <p>Core is Welfare Monitoring Unit in the Macroeconomic Policy and Planning Department in MOFED.</p>	<p>Planning and Regional Cooperation will monitor its implementation of the M&E strategy.</p> <p>National Inter-Agency Poverty Monitoring Groups are thematic, multi-stakeholder groups which will review performance in relevant areas.</p> <p>The Ghana Statistical Service will continue its Welfare Monitoring System but no clear link between this and new indicators.</p> <p>Office of President has oversight, Parliament will receive monthly reports and parliamentary sub-committees will sit on M&E Technical Committee</p>	<p>Economy (provides political guidance and oversight); MPRS Monitoring Committee comprising Principal Secretaries; Technical Working Committee (with members); and Government institutions responsible for monitoring. MoF will use three year MTEF and the annual Budget.</p> <p>The draft monitoring plan also outlines MPRS M&E specific units in sector ministries, Departments, National Assembly, and District Assemblies by May 2003.</p> <p>The Minister of State for Poverty Alleviation will have a stand</p>	<p>with range of participants.</p> <p>Some issues around need and capacity for co-ordination functions and the mechanisms for bringing on board civil society organisations and researchers.</p> <p>Strong link between the existing government monitoring of the annual PES and the key indicators in the PARPA.</p> <p>Weaknesses at the provincial and local level including the need to supplement the traditional top-down monitoring with a bottom-up approach. Qualitative aspects seem to be lagging behind.</p> <p>Some overlaps with Committee</p>	<p>will not be to undertake strategic planning but facilitate the planning of other departments – and ensuring usability of sectoral data. SMMPD needs to strengthen its relations with other departments, especially within key departments of MINECOFIN, with MINAGRI the Banques Populaires, other microfinance institutions, and NGOs and the Church. Four desk officers liaison between SPPMD and line ministries. Initially difficult relations (suspicious line ministries) but high level of contact has built better relations that involve two way information flows. Will also rely on existing annual reporting</p>	<p>and stresses key linkages between groups. Complex system but has considerable buy in from range of relevant actors. Cabinet oversees PMMP. Poverty Monitoring Steering Committee leads - broad membership. Linked is the Technical Committee for the Poverty Reduction Strategy, supported by a Poverty Monitoring Secretariat, hosted by VPO (not an empowered secretariat). Body of the system is made up of four Technical Working Groups (TWGs) which will do the substantial work on poverty monitoring and all involve a range of stakeholders (TWGs are:</p>	<p>monitoring and produces and analysis, also central in the development of the PEAP, and PEAP/PRSP Progress Reports, and leads on mainstreaming poverty issues into the budget and sector planning. Parliament, and Cabinet have overall oversight of the OPM and Poverty Eradication PRSC Steering Committee which has oversight of MFPED.</p> <p>The actual monitoring is done, by a range of different stakeholders who are represented on a Poverty Monitoring Network which developed PMES and oversees its implementation. PMAU is secretariat for the</p>	<p>coordination and M&E (including harmonisation of external financing and TA). Appropriate systems will be put in place to link provincial admin system and line ministries into M&E. In PRSP, states that national statistical system currently comprises the Central Statistical Office (including Living Conditions Monitoring Unit) Statistical Units in line ministries, parastatals, and other govt institutions Bank of Zambia Ministry of Finance and National Planning</p> <p>Also highlights the role of the Poverty Monitoring and Analysis Unit at the Zambia Social Investment Fund (ZAMSIF)</p>

	Ethiopia	Ghana	Malawi	Mozambique	Rwanda	Tanzania	Uganda	Zambia
			alone office to ensure implementation of Pillar 3 (poverty programmes and social protection). There are some risks of duplication.	for the Coordination of Consultations.	of MDAs to PM's office.	Surveys and Census, Routine Data Systems, Research and Analysis, and Dissemination, Sensitisation and Advocacy). The Ministry of Finance appears as one actor among several, in spite of its lead role in the MTEF and PRSP processes.	Network. PMES outlines responsibilities of each institution involved in the monitoring process.	Macro level monitoring will be carried out by the ZAMSIF and CSO. Sectors will monitor sector specific interventions. No explicit role for Cabinet or parliament.
Key outputs of the system	PRSP Annual Progress Report. Other outputs are as yet undefined.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarterly Bulletins • Annual Progress Report (will report on movements in all key indicators) 	No clear set of regular outputs planned. Annual Progress Report to be carried out in Jan/Feb following annual PER (all other reviews will roll in or be cancelled. Sector Reviews will provide input to overall review process).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarterly reports (as quarterly balance of PES) • Annual report (as annex to PES) – not entirely clear whether this will serve as the annual PRSP progress report for IFIs. • Annual Impact report (new output) 	Not clear from PRSP. Will build on annual reports from MDAs to PM's office. Importance of annual PRSP progress report highlighted at recent workshop.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Report in Poverty and Human Development (PHDR) (including a popular version) – information from this will feed into the annual PRSP progress report. • Reports on surveys, studies and analyses • Updates on Tanzania Socio Economic Database • Policy Briefings • Annually updated Poverty Monitoring Master Plan 	<p>PMES notes importance of regular comprehensive M&E reports as inputs to the PRSC policy matrix.</p> <p>Bi-annual Poverty Status Reports and analytical pieces such as discussion papers.</p> <p>PRSP progress reports will be a summary of the PSR every other year and a summary of the Background to the Budget in</p>	Will use already existing monitoring and evaluation instruments such as the annual Economic Report, Mid-year Economic Review, and Annual Reports of ministries and provinces. Annual PRSP progress report will be produced.

	Ethiopia	Ghana	Malawi	Mozambique	Rwanda	Tanzania	Uganda	Zambia
						• Seminars and workshops	intervening years.	
Indicators (see also matrix 1)	Chosen by PRSP Technical Committee and consultant. Subset of indicators developed in the sectors. Further work needed on translating PRSP priority actions into indicators. Sources of data are given in tables.	Indicators chosen by Consultation with MDAs (using consultant team), drawing on GPRS goals and targets (over 300), Medium Term Priorities, and sector objectives. Reflects priority areas of action. Sources of data are given in tables.	Targets proposed by each of the 21 Thematic Groups and then subjected to the fiscal discipline of the MTEF resource envelope. No targets on quality of education despite fact it is highest priority. Sources of data are given for core monitoring indicators, but not for others.	Indicators based on those normally used by sectors to monitor their activities. List to be discussed but includes indicators in each of the 'fundamental areas of action', including governance and justice. Sources given.	Indicators chosen through consultation. Performance assessment indicators closely linked to those used in MTEF and were chosen for suitability of index, consensus with technical services of line ministries, cost of monitoring the indicator. PRSP appears to provide at least some indicators for four of the six priority areas – no indicators for governance or institutional capacity building. These are currently being refined into a shorter list. Sources of data are given for most indicators.	Indicators chosen on the basis of extensive consultations. The Poverty and Welfare Monitoring Indicators booklet an important reference document. Indicators were chosen a) that had baselines (or would soon) b) for which data would be available in PRSP implementation period and c) which the PRSP might reasonably be expected to impact. PMMP provides indicators for all of priority areas. PRSP outlines sources of information for indicators, with explanations of the weaknesses and strengths of different data sources.	PMES states that priority indicators correspond to outcome targets that have been agreed for the sectors and to the key intermediate steps necessary to achieve those outputs. Also include the framework for monitoring the PRSC. Sources of data provided for each indicator.	Indicators were chosen by thematic WGs, and streamlined after National Summit for Poverty Reduction to match goals being measured. Cover every sector in PRSP. Sources of information given for core indicators and for wider indicator list.
Multidimensional	• Poverty and	• Overarching	• Consumption	Results and	• Health/nutrition	• social wellbeing	• Creating a	• Macroeconomic

	Ethiopia	Ghana	Malawi	Mozambique	Rwanda	Tanzania	Uganda	Zambia
ity of poverty (see also matrix 1)	<p>inequality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Food security • Agriculture • Health • HIV/AIDS • Education • Clean Water Supply • Roads 	<p>indicators (including malnutrition, accessibility of services, and others)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Macro-stability • Production and Gainful Employment • Human Resource Development • Vulnerable and Excluded • Governance indicators 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GDP per capita • Nutrition Status • Morbidity • Mortality • Life expectancy • Composite Welfare Index • Food production • Cash crop production • Animal production • Access to potable water • Access to sanitation • Access to health services • Fertility rate • HIV infection • Literacy rate • Net enrolment in education • Education attainments 	<p>Intermediate indicators at macro level:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education • Health • Roads • Energy • WSS • Agriculture/Rural Development • Governance • Macro Policy • Social Action • Housing <p>Also, reduced list of household impact indicators provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health and nutrition • Education • Agriculture and rural development • Food security • Employment • Energy • Basic infrastructure • Material well being 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education • Income/consumption poverty • Time poverty • Housing and settlements • Employment and wages 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • extreme vulnerability • nutrition • survival • human capabilities • income poverty. 	<p>framework for economic growth and transformation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good Governance and Security • Actions which directly increase the ability of the poor to raise their incomes • Quality of life <p>Indicators in PMES monitor quality of life through health, education and water/sanitation.</p>	<p>s</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agriculture • Tourism • Mining • Industry • Health • Education • HIV/AIDS • Gender (no indicators yet determined) • Environment • Energy • Water and sanitation • Transport and communication • Roads • Governance (no indicators yet determined)
Core set of indicators (see also matrix 1)	<p>PRSP gives an indicative list of 22 indicators (19 with baselines and year) and a shorter list of 9 performance indicators (of the</p>	<p>52 key indicators proposed, most with baselines. 11 of these are 'overarching indicators'.</p>	<p>Core set of 18 indicators (no baselines), and a further list of 70 selected indicators annexed. The complete list of</p>	<p>JSA notes that indicator table (40 indicators) represents an initial attempt to focus on a smaller number of key indicators for</p>	<p>50 indicators in main list (some have baselines although years are not given). Smaller set of 7 long term targets. Also a set of 13</p>	<p>Core set of (39) monitoring indicators, all with baseline or baseline soon to be produced baseline.</p>	<p>PMES outlines 30 core indicators selected from the key areas of the PEAP. Also annexed are around 100 indicators.</p>	<p>There is a set of around 45 indicators, drawn from wider list of around 250 indicators. Target years as 2004 although some</p>

	Ethiopia	Ghana	Malawi	Mozambique	Rwanda	Tanzania	Uganda	Zambia
	performance indicators 2 of the 5 outcome indicators have no baseline).		indicators is in the technical document (number unknown). One fifth of the targeted indicators have no baseline – those with baselines often do not give year.	each priority area. About half have no baselines or do not indicate the current situation. Those that do have baselines specify the year the data was collected.	'performance assessment indicators' (with more thorough baselines though not always appropriately quantified).		The original (2000) PRSP did not show baselines or annual aims, and did not indicate how the base data would be collected or how much this would cost. PMES notes the baselines of most indicators and specifies which year data is from.	baselines will not have been established by then. In wider list, not all indicators have baselines.
Realism of targets and specificity of indicators	Clear set of indicators and targets for social sectors. Further work needed on specific year-by-year targets. Some targets seem to be very ambitious – wants to quintuple the quantity of fertilizer consumption by 2004/5.	Core indicators are specific and measurable. Technical definitions given for most indicators, though some are to be defined (e.g. accessibility of services).	Targets are specific and for the most part measurable. Omission of certain basic input and output targets in health and education. Government unlikely to be able to measure the poverty headcount ration to nearest decimal place by 2004.	At time of publication of the PRSP, some indicators were provisional and precise quantities needed to be established. Targets and indicators best specified (and most realistic) in those sectors where SWAp is in place	List of 50 indicators is sometimes vague about what is being monitored ('time use') but generally specific. Final outcome targets are ambitious – linked with MDGs. Performance assessment indicators similarly ambitious and mostly quite specific.	Targets set out in PRSP logframe are sometimes vague (reduced burden of disease through reduced morbidity, build capacity to all communities needing safety net programmes). Indicators in PMMP indicators appear to more be specific and measurable.	Some of the indicators in 2000 PRSP were a little unrealistic (though better than the 1997 document). PMES indicators that appear to be specific and measurable for the most part.	JSA also notes need for clarity in core goals and targets. No quantification of core indicators.
Attention to inputs and intermediate indicators as	Need to define intermediate output indicators – food security is	Sectors contain targets on share of government spend and	No indicators or targets specified for inputs.	Tables provided for process and impact indicators at macro and	Indicators are broken down into outcome (e.g. income poverty),	PMS focuses on impact, outcome and proxy indicators. Not	PMES will be concerned with the 'whole chain of conditions that	PRSP states that intermediate indicators are those under

	Ethiopia	Ghana	Malawi	Mozambique	Rwanda	Tanzania	Uganda	Zambia
well as final outcomes? Evidence of attention to the 'monitoring chain'	<p>measured only in terms of final outcomes and agricultural progress is only measured by short-term outputs.</p> <p>Includes indicators and targets on education and health shares of budget.</p> <p>Has a list of indicators and then a list of performance indicators – quantitative indicators (e.g. condom distribution) and process indicators (e.g. reconciliation of monetary and fiscal accounts).</p>	<p>intermediate indicators (e.g. proportion of supervised deliveries). Also some key process indicators (e.g. timely disbursement of budgeted allocations).</p>		<p>sectoral level, and a table for household impact indicators.</p> <p>For monitoring PES, each sector has defined a series of priority intermediate and results indicators that will be followed annually to evaluate the implementation processes.</p>	<p>access (e.g. book pupil ratio), process (e.g. GDP growth), and proxy (characteristics of the poor). There are also targets (along lines of MDGs) and performance assessment indicators that seem to be more intermediate (e.g. number of qualified health personnel, use of selected seeds). Recent workshop stressed importance of the chain, but PRSP does not appear to address this specifically.</p>	<p>presently a strategic list showing chain. PMS states that sectors adequately track outputs and PER/MTEF tracks inputs.</p>	<p>are the means to achieving the objectives of the PEAP and monitoring the outputs and the outcomes.' Experience to date has illustrated importance of being able to draw together information from whole monitoring chain for policy change (Lars Moller notes the water sector chain was a good example of this, showing that additional resources are not value for money, but usually very hard to identify chain.)</p>	<p>control of implementing agencies, while final indicators are mostly composed of aspects of welfare not directly under implementing agency control. Intermediate will be tracked annually while final outcomes less frequently. Monthly budget allocations will continue to be published.</p> <p>In detailed list of indicators, JSA notes that there is an attempt to balance intermediate and final indicators, although not always achieved.</p>
In particular, is there attention to budget reform and public expenditure tracking?	<p>PRSP includes indicators and targets on education and health shares of budget. Public expenditure monitoring not addressed in monitoring</p>	<p>System notes the National Expenditure Tracking System to be rolled out to all district assemblies. Also notes MTEF.</p>	<p>Integrated Financial Management Information System (IFMIS) being introduced – challenges remain. Existing expenditure tracking system</p>	<p>Monitoring of budget execution is laid out as one of three central processes and involves monitoring of inputs (through quarterly budget reports and other</p>	<p>Monitoring of budget is part of monitoring system and PETS is a core instrument. Role of MTEF specifically noted.</p>	<p>Poverty Monitoring System will link to the monitoring of resource allocation and expenditure through budgeting, PER and MTEF</p>	<p>The PMES will track the proportion of national budget used for poverty focussed programmes. The PMES does not specifically outline relations</p>	<p>The indicators include proportion of budget spent on 'PRSP sectors'.</p> <p>In September 01 GoZ instituted the HIPC Expenditure Monitoring team.</p>

	Ethiopia	Ghana	Malawi	Mozambique	Rwanda	Tanzania	Uganda	Zambia
	section, although GoE is embarking on large multi-sector capacity building project that will assist in the modernisation of its accountability and financial systems. .		will be adjusted to the demands of MPRS needs. Also an annual PER. The draft plan states that existing systems such as the IFMS and the Pensions and Payroll Integration will need to be brought under the overall mandate of the National Steering Committee	budget reports prepared by MPF, as well as Sector Expenditure Reviews).		processes, but does not specify a formal framework for doing so. Recent PHDR includes an analysis of expenditure in some sectors. PRBS review May 02 stated that "The monitoring processes that occur simultaneously during the year...need better coordination with the budget process."	with MTEF, but core secretariat (PMAU) is located in MoFED and has relatively tight links with resource allocation process.	Not clear that this has moved forward. PRSP recommends that expenditure is also captured in expenditure tracking systems, but no clear mechanism proposed. Monthly budget allocations will continue to be published.
Instruments to be used	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • surveys (HICE, Welfare Monitoring Survey, plus) • censuses • administrative data • participatory studies (including 1997 PPA and PRSP consultation data, and non-gvt surveys – no clear plans for 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GSS existing welfare monitoring system (includes CWIQ, DHS, and census) • MDA reports • Budget statements and Auditor General Reports • Notes 2 small impact assessments to be carried out to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PFM and MIS info • surveys and censuses (CWIQ, HIS, DHS, QUIM) • crop estimates and food price surveys. • qualitative material. • participatory planning and assessment at local level. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantitative impact monitoring (through QUIBB, and data from census, national surveys, etc) – strength of system • Qualitative monitoring will be designed to complement QUIBB. New instrument, the <i>Aviação Participativa da</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CWIQ • crop production surveys • PETS • Census • national poverty assessment • citizens' report cards. <p>Linkages and integration not spelled out in PRSP.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • routine data • censuses • surveys • village register and community interview • regular PPAs (although participatory monitoring is limited). <p>Multi-year survey plan integrated with routine data</p>	<p>PMES will use</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • surveys • PPA • administrative data. <p>Stresses integration of surveys and PPAs and states relationship:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surveys shall influence choice of research areas for PPAs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National census • Household surveys (income poverty and living conditions survey, the Post Harvest Survey, and DHS) • Administrative records • Management information systems • Special surveys • Participatory

	Ethiopia	Ghana	Malawi	Mozambique	Rwanda	Tanzania	Uganda	Zambia
	<p>more participatory work).</p> <p>Currently assessing possibility of poverty mapping to bring together survey and census data. Little indication that lighter instruments will be used.</p>	<p>feed into next year's budget process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One longer term impact study • A number of thematic studies (e.g. land tenure) 	<p>Need to clarify how these qualitative data will be combined and integrated with quantitative data.</p> <p>PRSP discusses CWIQ as being light and cost-effective enough to conduct every year (while more comprehensive integrated household survey will be conducted every 5 years).</p>	<p><i>Pobreza</i> (APP) was in 2001. Weaker side of system and not clear exactly how qualitative information will be integrated into the Annual Impact Report.</p> <p>Need for Government's proposals for qualitative, participatory and independent monitoring to be more fully developed.</p> <p>APPs might take place every two years, with less ambitious Participatory Rural Appraisal exercises undertaken in intervening years.</p>	<p>PRSP shows report on socioeconomic conditions (a light survey) being conducted annually.</p>	<p>systems. Annual PHDR should integrate qualitative and quantitative data (though challenges remain).</p> <p>TSED will be used as the repository for all quantitative data emerging from the poverty monitoring system and as one of the main dissemination tools.</p> <p>Decision not to employ light instruments such as CWIQ on the grounds that information could be gathered elsewhere (but maintained as fallback position).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PPAs shall explore unanswered questions and the processes of implementation (input – outputs-outcomes). <p>However, PMES notes that it is almost impossible to integrate data sets from different sources at present.</p> <p>Workshop last year highlighted possibility of lighter instruments, but noted that survey unit was already overstretched without additional light surveys. Second national PPA will not be naive but would be guided by prior analysis on key bottlenecks.</p>	<p>assessments</p> <p>Not clear how all these will be reflected in annual economic report, mid-year economic review. No indication of use of light instrument.</p>
Recognition of poor quality routine/administrative data?	<p>PRSP: plans to strengthen data collection systems. Includes integrating routine</p>	<p>A new national M&E (information management) system will be used with some modifications (to link with the</p>	<p>80% of the indicators derive from administrative records.</p> <p>PRSP recognises</p>	<p>The MPF intends to improve information flows and systems with other ministries to reinforce compatibility with</p>	<p>PRSP relies on current information systems. Passing recognition that this information may be weak.</p>	<p>The PMMP stresses the various challenges of routine data systems at present (ensuring</p>	<p>PMES states: 'In the best of cases, sectoral MIS data are of questionable value for assessing</p>	<p>Problem not recognised in PRSP.</p>

	Ethiopia	Ghana	Malawi	Mozambique	Rwanda	Tanzania	Uganda	Zambia
	administrative data with proposed program of surveys and census, and harmonising the indicator systems used at various levels of govt. Later notes that most systematic monitoring of administrative data takes place in sectors.	NTES system, to capture district profiles and to allow more flexible reporting).	problem. Says 'current administrative data collection systems and their higher level information management systems are plagued with quality problems' including coverage of data and staff incentives for filling in records. But systems will be reassessed in light of MPRS and staff provided with suitable incentives.	the PARPA indicators. Presently, some activities are reported as "work being undertaken" - not comprehensive enough for PARPA monitoring purposes. Agriculture and Health have made progress in adjusting their systems to meet PARPA requirements, while Education is lagging.	Ministries and provinces also submit annual reports to Prime Minister (not clear how these are linked to MTEF reporting but appears to be linked). Recent workshop did not address this issue.	the quality and timeliness of data, ensuring the data are in appropriate format, coordinating various RDS currently in use, providing downward as well as upward information flow) and outline sector specific challenges. The Routine Data Working Group is one of four TWGs. Faces a number of management problems.	performance towards improved outcomes. Even their reliability on basic sectoral outputs is a problem.' Facility based (rather than community based) data is produced, and institutions face inadequate logistical support and skills, and weak incentives. GoU will improve MIS for priority sectors but will continue to rely on surveys to complement.	
Participatory monitoring	Civil society offered role in M&E but nature of role and specific mechanisms left unclear. Financial information from woredas is not currently available to NGOs but PRSP notes that NGOs will have access to woreda level	Civil society will be involved in monitoring through PIAs and participatory expenditure tracking. There will be dissemination of reports to specific groups and stakeholders on a timely basis. Recent workshop on Participatory	Formal monitoring system will be based on existing system but broader range of stakeholder involvement. Mechanism unclear. GoM will introduce trial schemes to enable communities to	M&E strategy assigns at least nine different sorts of roles and responsibilities to CS, both as members of and interlocutors with the Observatory. Mechanisms for bringing on board civil society organisations and researchers need to be clarified.	PRSP seeks to build capacity for independent research institute to carry out Citizens Report Cards. Also commits to making information available through documentation centres and decentralised administrative offices. No clear	Intention is that overlapping membership of the TWGs and other committees will bring traditional generators of information into direct contact with users including civil society. Capacity difficulties in maintaining overlapping	PMES notes need to streamline and clarify roles of CSOs in monitoring work. CSOs are members of PMN. Dissemination and joint reporting of findings from various sources well established – two yearly Poverty Status	PRSP states that civil society plays 'an important role' in collecting and analysing additional info and data. Mechanism unclear.

	Ethiopia	Ghana	Malawi	Mozambique	Rwanda	Tanzania	Uganda	Zambia
	information on development plans. Emphasis is on NGOs then giving information on how they will contribute to the implementation of these plans. PRSP notes need to strengthen dissemination of information.	Approaches to Monitoring and PEM in Ghana included civil society. One outcome was commitment of the NDPC, the MEPRC and GSS to initiate steps towards incorporating Participatory M&E in its GPRS monitoring.	monitor government at all levels – mechanism unclear. Civil society will be used to disseminate information to all stakeholders. MEJN and CISANET are most actively involved in monitoring activities.	GoM has committed to facilitating public access to PARPA information, but NGOs believe that GoM has not yet acted on this. CS not aware of the details of the M&E strategy, and none (except possibly Mozambique Debt Group) had been party to discussions with GoM about it or played any role in formulating it. Several CSOs have produced concrete proposals for their involvement in monitoring.	role for civil society in PRSP monitoring. Recent workshop noted that SPPMD needs to strengthen its relationship with NGOs and churches.	membership and in keeping links with the key users on the policy side. Also, few CSOs are currently sitting in the Technical Working Groups. Although invited to participate, few CSOs were actually engaged in the drafting of the PMMP. Dissemination emphasised as key element, particularly using the TSED and Tanzania Online. First Poverty Policy Week was held recently - various reports on poverty and PRSP progress were launched and discussed.	Reports and other outputs of PMAU (MoFPED). Also note Poverty Forum where gov't and civil society can debate issues. Uganda Debt Network has created district-level 'Poverty Action Fund Monitoring Committees', providing alternative information on whether expenditures have matched commitments. Findings presented to PRSP Monitoring Committee. Ugandan civil society engagement has been proactive and more autonomous than in other countries.	
Role of parliaments?	Not mentioned in PRSP.	Parliament will receive monthly reports in the proposed system and representatives of certain sub-	The draft plan outlines MPRS M&E specific units in sector ministries, Departments, National	Parliament given competence to call ministers before parliament to report on the progress of PARPA. First	Not clear from PRSP or recent workshop.	Not clear from PMMP or PRSP. Dissemination working group will ensure that civil society inputs are disseminated to	Parliament and Cabinet have overall oversight of the OPM and Poverty Eradication PRSC Steering	Not specified in PRSP.

	Ethiopia	Ghana	Malawi	Mozambique	Rwanda	Tanzania	Uganda	Zambia
		committees will sit on the M&E technical committee. Office of the President (which oversees the M&E Technical Committee) will provide a link to Cabinet	Assembly, and District Assemblies by May 2003. Also parliamentary committees sit on technical working groups.	presentation and discussion in Parliament was held in March 2002 - to take place regularly. No special Parliament committee established - work related to PARPA divided among three existing committees.		Parliament.	Committee which has oversight of MFPED.	
Attention to sub-national level	Main focus of monitoring is at national level, but notes various issues with regions and woredas – plans to address not well developed and main emphasis is on upward information flow.	PRSP M&E plan relied heavily on Planning and Coordination Units at district and regional level – current strategy notes that their capacity to deliver reliable information is not sufficiently developed and that the focus shall be on delivering information to these units rather than extracting information from them.	The draft plan outlines MPRS M&E specific units in sector ministries, Departments, National Assembly, and District Assemblies by May 2003. Long term goal is that decentralised structures should play a full role. Plans not well developed.	The monitoring plan does not discuss the sub-national level. Need to supplement the traditional top-down monitoring with a bottom-up approach.	PRSP notes reliance on annual reports from the provinces to the PM's office (upward information flow). Ubudehe also has a key role but will take some time to deliver.	PMMP shows upward and downward information flows reaching to village level. Local Government M&E system is likely to take some time to deliver and there will be data needs in the meantime that require some kind of monitoring below national level.	District authorities shall monitor the implementation of the PEAP in their authorities.	At local level, district planning units will work through District Development Coordinating Committees (and same at Provincial level). Commits to suitable links between the local and national processes.
Costing the system?	No attempt made in PRSP.	Draft plan sets costs at approximately £2.6 million for	The draft monitoring plan provides costs: approx £1.6	No costings are set out in PRSP document.	No attempt made to cost the system.	PRSP estimates that the total cost (after first year) will be around	The PMES is not yet costed but there are intentions to do	No attempt made in PRSP.

	Ethiopia	Ghana	Malawi	Mozambique	Rwanda	Tanzania	Uganda	Zambia
		2002 - 2004	million per annum.			US\$1.5 million per annum.	so.	